GAMING COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING JUNE 7, 2006

COPY

The above-captioned business meeting was stenographically taken down by me, Robin L. Helton, a notary public in and for the County of Marion, State of Indiana, at 1:00 p.m., on June 7, 2006, at the Indianapolis Marriott Downtown, Indiana Ballroom, 350 West Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, and the following transcript is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings held.

CIRCLE CITY REPORTING

2050 First Indiana Plaza 135 North Pennsylvania Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317) 635-7857

APPEARANCES COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Harold Calloway, Chairman Donald Raymond Vowels Tim Murphy Tim Fesko Bryan Robinson William Barrett Earnest Yelton, Executive Director Phil Sicuso, General Counsel Jennifer Arnold, Deputy Director Kevin Mahan, Superintendent Tami Timberland, Secretary

CHAIRMAN CALLAWAY: Good afternoon. Welcome to 1 2 the June 7th Indiana Gaming Commission meeting. 3 Before I have a roll call, I would like to introduce the new commissioner. It is my pleasure 4 5 to introduce our newest commissioner, Bill Barrett. 6 Commissioner Barrett is an attorney and a partner 7 in the law firm of Williams, Hewitt, Barrett & 8 Wilkowski in Greenwood, Indiana. He's a cum laude 9 graduate of Indiana University School of Law and 10 has clerked for the Court of Appeals, Judge John Baker and Tax Court Judge Tom Fisher. Commissioner 11 12 Barrett also serves as litigation counsel for Johnson County. Commissioner Barrett replaced 13 14 Commissioner Scott Newman who resigned as his other 15 increase demand on his business, Criminal Forensic 16 Laboratory. Welcome, Mr. Barrett.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CALLAWAY: At this time we would like to have a roll call vote then. Don Vowels.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Don Vowels, Evansville.

COMMISSIONER CALLAWAY: Marya Rose. Tim Fesko.

COMMISSIONER FESKO: Yes, Tim Fesko, Lake County.

COMMISSIONER CALLAWAY: Tim Murphy. Bryan Robinson. William Barrett.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: William Barrett, Greenwood.

COMMISSIONER CALLAWAY: I'm Harold Callaway from Evansville. We are going to delay the approval of the minutes until we have another commissioner here. Don was not at our last meeting, therefore, we need at least four commissioners to vote in the affirmative in order for something to pass.

Now, we will have a report of the executive director.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. I will begin the executive director's report on our staffing issues within the commission. Since we last met, Jenny Chels has retired as our director of compliance. And Nathan Battinich resigned as our IT programer. I'm pleased to announce our new appointments, which came from within the agency. Chris Gray -- Chris, will you stand -- is now serving as our compliance director. And Larry Rhoades -- Larry, thank you -- was promoted to Chris' position as lead field auditor of our northern boats.

We are also very fortunate this year to have three interns from the governor's summer program. Returning for his second year -- after the first year we weren't sure he was going to come back, we're glad he did -- Dan Becker. Dan just graduated from Cornell and will be beginning law school at Duke University this August.

Next is Joe Cooper. Joe is from Walkerton,
Indiana, and next year he will be a senior at
Walbash College majoring in English.

And last, but certainly not least, we have
Mindy Westerick. Mindy is from Auburn and is
studying political science at the University of
Indianapolis where she will be a senior next year.

We also have new hires both in charity gaming and in the investigation and enforcement divisions of the agency. And we will make those introductions during those particular agenda presentations.

I will report that when I became executive director in January of 2005, soaking wet, we had a staff of 30. Today, we have a staff of 125. And at the conclusion of the transition of the Indiana State Police, as well as charity gaming, we will probably have a staff membership of somewhere

between 180 and 185 individuals.

Secondly, we have a report on litigation, which at this time is fortunately very brief.

Another 90-day stay was stipulated in the Laport

County action that was brought by the City of East

Chicago for a judicial review of our administrative action in approving the license transfer from

Harris to Resorts. We predict that will expire on or about July 17th. At this time we do not anticipate any further extensions and intend to request the court to rule on our pending motion to dismiss on expiration of the stay.

Additionally, an individual has filed in

Dearborn County Court an adverse possession action

claiming a portion of the land that is owned by

Argosy. The IGC was named as an additional party

defendant in a peripheral role and the Attorney

General has filed a motion to dismiss on our

behalf, which should be ruled upon very soon.

Next, as we've indicated to you before, the Indiana Gaming Commission is the first nationally in the industry to conduct a disparity study for women and minority business enterprises. And spearheading that event, that effort, has been our Deputy Director, Jenny Arnold. And I'm going to

ask Jenny to give you an update on the progress of the disparity study.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR ARNOLD: Thank you, Executive Director Yelton. Good afternoon, Commissioners. As the Executive Director just said, we have contacted Ford disparity studies. Our research is going to be done to the center of urban policy environment here in Indianapolis. And if the study finds that minorities in business are underutilized, the statute requires the commission to establish utilization goals for the riverboat. The majority of work to date has focused on gathering and organizing data from the riverboat. Although we have experienced several setbacks, the data base now has information on over 10,000 vendors with whom the riverboats have done business since 2003. Some of the data has been delivered to our research review, and he is in the process of performing a tests analysis. Please, don't ask me what that means.

At the direction of our advisory group, we have worked to develop a significant outreach effort. We've had encouraging input from both NBE and WBE firms, as well as non NBE and non WBE firms. We intend, with the assistance of the

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

casino association, to send out a statewide press release regarding the study. And outreach meetings will be held in Evansville, Lawrenceburg, East Chicago and Indianapolis. We are really hoping that the business community will take an active interest in this study, because without significant input from them, it will be very difficult to arrive at an accurate conclusion. At this point we hope to complete the study by the end of the year. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Thank you, Jenny.

For those of you who have been keeping score, the bidding war for the acquisition of Aztar now has a victor. The bidding began with Pinnacle Entertainment offering to purchase Aztar stock in the four properties at the respectful rate of \$38 per share. Then Resorts Colony and Ameristar entered the fray, upping the anti considerably. Lake LaVerne (phonetic), which is Kentucky-based Columbia Entertainment, pushed the bar to an all-time high cash offer of \$54 per share, which rumor has it now that Jim Brown has passed Larry Kinzer as the most wealthy GM in the State of Indiana. Sorry.

In any event, William Yung, and that's

Y-u-n-g, the sole owner of Columbia, travelled to Indianapolis and introduced himself to me and the staff and explained the corporation to us.

Columbia is currently licensed in Nevada,

Mississippi, New Jersey and Louisianna, and has a pending application in Illinois. Without any commitment, members of the commission, we are aiming for our meeting in November for consideration of the petition to transfer ownership.

I do want to bring you an update on Blue Sky. The operating agent contract with Blue Sky provided for it to conclude its financial arrangements by February 1st. The package included a \$270,000,000 bond issue and revolver up to and including \$30,000,000. Representatives of Blue Sky contacted us indicating that the financing would not be consummated by that date and asked for a waiver. General counsel, Phil Sicuso, researched this issue and discovered while the commission could not extend a waiver, it could decide not to recommend any action. Accordingly, we agreed not to take any affirmative action on the issue until May 1st and Blue Sky was so notified.

While the bonds were sold successfully, the

terms of the revolver were not as attractive as hoped, and it was not executed. We subsequently notified Blue Sky that it was in default of the original contractual term on the financing deadline and also in default in our letter of forbearance. We added that the recommended result of this breach would be presented to the commission at its September meeting, which it will.

I can, however, today report that the revolver has been fully executed with Ortex, Orex, (phonetic) excuse me, and is scheduled to close now on the June 30th. We will, however, report this issue to you at the next meeting.

On a further note Blue Sky has confirmed that it is still on schedule for the opening of the casino during probably the very first part of the month of November of this year.

Additionally, as executive director, I'm required to report to you all waivers that were executed by me during the last quarter, or at least before our last meeting. We had several waivers that applied to all the votes. First of all, we granted a waiver approving a separate shipment of boot proms from slot machines instead of the EPROMs. Boot proms are part of the new technology

on slot machines that are offered by IGT. We granted a waiver to allow only poker room viewers to hold their own tokes as opposed to pulling them. Also, waivers were granted for all of the licensees to cash cage checks written to patrons by licensees or other Indiana riverboats. Checks written to patrons by sister properties and checks written to entertainment vendors.

Next, all votes were granted relief from storing the entire PAR sheet in the electronic gaming device, and they will be required to store only that part of the PAR sheet containing the exact EPROM and hold a percentage, and that electronic copy or hard copy of the entire PAR sheet will be readily available on site.

Due to the purchase of Trump by Majestic Star,
Majestic Star I and Majestic Star II asked for and
received several waivers. First, they were granted
relief from having a security guard in the VIP
room, which has a boarding ramp onto the vessel,
and these patrons would have already passed through
the main turnstiles. We granted a waiver allowing
Majestic Star II to utilize the equipment of
Majestic Star I and shared credit practices and
policies. Two riverboats will be using the same

playing cards, value chips, non-value chips, promotional chips, table layouts, and roulette and big six wheels. The two riverboats will also have one credit policy and one marker bank.

Additionally, Majestic Star requested and received relief from various regulations relating to token acceptance of the EGDs; fill amounts and probe level, token acceptor, hopper mechanism, drop box process, jet sort testing, comparison of actual toke drop system, internal audit observing and testing, and hopper fills and credits.

Also, Majestic received a waiver from investigating negative chip float inventories on the individual riverboats, but will be required to do an investigation report to the commission if any of the consolidated float is negative. They were also granted a relief to transfer of a waiver -- excuse me. We transferred a waiver that we previously granted to Trump Casino approving the discontinuation of drop door meters displaying when a door has been opened in a ticket machine.

Finally, Majestic Star asked and received a waiver from various regulations as they apply to the hopper fills and manual fills, fill slips, audit verification and review and internal audit

review and verification of fill slips.

Caesars asked and received three waivers. The first is to allow the management employees to receive a bonus in its contacts to the Midwest Regional Poker Championship Promotion. They were also allowed -- we allowed their dealers to accept currency as tips only during the term of play. And finally, they received a waiver to allow the table game supervisors to withdrawal front money for the patrons.

Grand Victoria received a request to destroy redeemed TITO tickets after a 90 day retention period. Argosy is allowed to have six spots for wagering on their blackjack layouts. And finally, Resorts received authority to allow drop team members to enter the soft count after the count has begun.

And that concludes all of the waivers that have been granted since our last meeting, as well as the executive director's report. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you, Mr. Yelton.

Are there any questions for the executive director?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I have a couple of thoughts here. The situation with Blue Sky, my understanding is that the Lauth Group has had

financing in place but there was a side agreement with the Cook Group that if it wasn't in place by April 15th, that 25 percent of the Lauth Group's interest would transfer to the Cook Group. The first concern I have is that's in violation of the statute that does not allow a transfer of an ownership interest to another entity even if it is within the licensee, without the approval of the Gaming Commission, or even to the degree that they hypothecated this license.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: At this point in time, there has been no determination as to whether or not there has been any shift and over shift.

That is still under debate.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Has there been litigation in reference to that or not?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: No. It's my understanding there is arbitration.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So there is a disagreement between the two parties at this point?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It's my understanding there is.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Also, I have a concern about the failure to obtain financing, and it's been since last summer. And the Lauth Group has

failed to obtain financing. It's hard to say the following lawyers to the Cook Group, but the Cook Group went out of their way to say that the West Baden Hotel had the opportunity to apply for a license when this French Lick license opened up and they agreed to do that. I'm sure there are taxes involved in the 35 something million dollars for the West Baden Hotel, but they didn't have to do that. Now they have partnered up with the Lauth Group in a form that we are all aware of the Cook Group's involvement in that, but it appears to me they are getting farther and farther sucked into something that they didn't want to get into in the first place. We are well aware that the Cook Group has a lot of money. And I assume that since Lauth has not -- Blue Sky has told us that they've moved forward on the project, that it's actually the Cook Group, I assume, that is paying for this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Since we set the precedent with the concern about Trump and subsequent bankruptcy, which the gaming commission was aware of when the license was granted to them in the summer of 2005, I'm concerned if we did not set a precedent or revisit this license about the Lauth Group having almost a year and still unable to obtain financing.

What is the gaming commissions position on all of that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: First of all,
Mr. Vowels, I'm not sure what you are saying,
"Lauth is unable to gain financing." This is Blue
Sky, not individuals. And the \$270,000,000 bond
issue was sold on favorable terms. There has
always been a controversy as to whether or not the
revolver was necessary or not necessary. It has
been the position of the gaming commission that it
was going to be necessary and we were going to
consider it and we asked Dr. Sullivan to consider
it as well when she did her recommendations to the
members of the commission.

Even in light of our thoughts that we needed to consider the revolver, we always knew that revolver -- if it were to be used, would be used at the very end, if not after opening. So when we come back with a recommendation at the next meeting, the reality of the delay in getting the final revolver approved is most definitely a breach of what we have asked them to do. We have yet to see any adverse impact of that delay on the project itself. I don't know if that answers your question.

She did --

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I quess it does. bottom line, they haven't been able to get financing. We had a problem with Trump, but we don't seem to have a problem with Blue Sky; is that incorrect?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I see it as two separate issues. Obviously, we think it's an issue or we would not have said we're going to bring it to the board for consideration.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Has Dr. Sullivan done any further analysis of this project since the license was granted last year?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Yes. GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Her last analysis was for the last commission meeting where we actually -- the commission approved their amended financing package at that time. That's when the overall indebtedness was increased from \$270,000,000 to \$300,000,000. So her last analysis was in early 2006.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It did include both of these amounts.

COMMISSIONER CALLAWAY: So what is Cook -what are their concerns with Lauth?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I don't know how

to define "concerns." You will probably have to ask Cook that and we will certainly put them on the agenda for the next meeting. If there is -- I know there is an internal dispute between the two organizations, as Mr. Vowels has indicated; one of the contractual terms between them on the date of the financing. That has not been resolved. We have received every assurance, of which I am accepting at this point in time is true, that this dispute will not impact the construction opening or financing of the project as proposed.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I think one point that needs to be addressed is that the financing has closed except for the \$30,000,000 portion of the revolver.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It's been fully executed. I mean, they don't close until the end of June. So all the money is there. It's just a question of it didn't get there, all of it, in the time frame that we gave them to do so.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Well, nobody called me from the commission office, but I think I read in the paper where Cook and Lauth had a disagreement, and you said they were going to arbitration.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Correct, that's my

understanding.

2.4

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: So that being the case, then you don't see where there is some concern from Cook?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Again, you are going to have to define "concern." There is an issue between them and they are in the process of attempting to resolve it. And just because there is an issue between them, we have seen nothing that has impacted the project at all.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: I wasn't on the commission when we had the situation with Trump, so how does that parallel with that or does it?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Well, there are some similarities but there are obviously some great differences. The Trump organization was in reorganizational bankruptcy and giving no assurances that they would ever commence the project which they had not received a contract for. And it was through investigations and conclusion by this commission that they were not going to be able to give a commitment that would satisfactorily satisfy the members of this commission that we would have a completed project and a financially viable project. This is -- like I said, we have

seen nothing between this issue between the two groups that has impacted the project in any fashion whatsoever.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: As chairman of the commission, I would like to be informed on the steps that are being taken here so when people at home ask me what's going on, I at least have some semblance of knowledge of what is happening other than reading it in the paper.

Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I have nothing further. Not on that issue.

Real quick on this Columbia Sussex purchase of Aztar in Evansville.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Chairman CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: And

I -- I guess we don't run in the same circles,

Harold, because I never see you in Evansville, and
the only time I see you is when we come up here.

So we haven't had any discussion about --

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You don't hang out in the hood, do you?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Actually, Harold, I don't think you hang out in the hood, either. This

is our new vice chairman of the republican party in Evansville. You can figure that one out later.

2.0

But, anyway, Columbia Sussex, they were denied the license in Missouri. The bottom line is, Harold and I being in Evansville is going to have to listen to a lot of whining from the people who live there unless we are fully apprised of everything about William Yung and Columbia Sussex.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: May I start by saying one thing?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: They were never denied a license.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. Well, has Missouri shared their information with this commission?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: No. We asked for that information and they refused to give it to us until there was finality of selection and an application has been filed. Now that has been done. And I don't know that we have followed up on the request, but we were denied the first time we asked.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Finality of the application here in Indiana or --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: The finality of the bidding process, which we believe to be concluded, and the actual filling of the application with us, which has now been done. In fact, even Pinnacle Entertainment had filed an application with us with a nonrefundable \$50,000 fee, which they probably regret now. But with the \$78 billion, they are probably okay with it.

So, Don, I can't answer if we followed up.

This was just recently done in the last week to 10 days, and we've been very occupied with todays meeting and tomorrows meeting. It may not have been done.

these transfers before and I have read all of the materials that were sent to me, and I'm sure all the other commissioners have. It's not that our hometown is highlighted any differently, but the reality of it is, we are going to be living with this thing, so I would really like to feel more comfortable in knowing just what happened in Missouri before Columbia Sussex is going to get my vote for the transfer. So just a quick note on that.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I assure you that

will be done. We probably share the very same concerns. While it was not denied, it was withdrawn.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. And being on this commission, we all know that sometimes things are phrased in ways that are hence to other commissions and maybe they aren't. But I really want to be able to eyeball that very specifically when it comes up.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I assure you, you will have that opportunity.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I don't have any other questions.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you. Now we will have a report from the superintendent division of gaming.

SUPERINTENDENT MAHAN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon commissioners. I

do apologize for not being at the March 9th meeting

of the Blue Chip Casino. As you learned from

Deputy Director Arnold, who gave my report at that

meeting, I was in a training session with our first

recruit class of gaming at the Law Enforcement

Academy.

Since that last report, I'm pleased to

announce that the -- Indiana's first gaming agent academy recruit class graduated on March 29th.

This recruit class is a very diverse group of people coming from many different backgrounds and experiences. Once they graduated from the academy, they then completed a three-week on-site field training at Majestic Star I and II.

I do want to publically thank the Majestic Star management team for working with us and also helping us design and implement the field training program. We kind of invented the wheel, so to speak, when it came to this type of training and I couldn't have been any happier with the outcome.

I would also like to publically thank

Mike Smith with the casino association. I know he went out of his way to assist us in gathering a lot of table games and things like that. And also

Mr. Kinzer from Argosy in the loaning of a lot of the table games and things. So we set up our own little casino at the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy for a week-long training and we thank you for your cooperation.

By this time the 19 agents now have over two months under their belts of providing enforcement regulatory activity to MS 1 and 2, and again, we

are just very proud of their efforts.

Regulatory and compliance matters up there have been dealt with in a professional, timely and consistent manner. And the slot machines are being EPROM and put on the gaming floor at a much more rapid pace. We are also now providing 24-hour-a-day badges at MS 1 and MS 2. That was not only a welcome reception to the management team but also to the employees there as well.

I know that in talking with many different people, there has been some concerns over how this transition is going to take place with this new division. However, I do encourage any of the other nine general managers who are sitting in the ranks, kind of waiting for this transition, feel free to contact Majestic Star, talk with their management team, and I think you will find out they are very pleased with how smoothe things went.

Last Wednesday, the 31st, we just began our second recruit training class at the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy. Currently, there are 31 individuals who are in the class, and once they are trained they will be placed on Casino Aztar, Blue Sky and Caesars. They are scheduled to graduate on July 25th, and they will begin their three-week

training on July 26th. We just made conditional offers of employment to 23 other individuals who will be assigned to Belterra and Grand Victoria Casinos. They will begin their training on June 26th, and they are scheduled to graduate on August 18th. They will then begin their three-week training on the 21st of August. It was our goal in this process to also include Argosy with the third recruit class, but for reasons beyond our control, we were unfortunately unable to accomplish that goal.

Therefore, the plan of action from here is to return back to Lake County, who will be hiring for Horseshoe and Resorts. We are posting the positions — the gaming agent positions in the state job bank beginning June 14th, and we hope to graduate this class at the end of November. After the first of the year, we are then going to finish up with Blue Chip and Argosy, in what will be the fifth gaming agent class. If all goes well, we should have all 11 casinos transitioned by early spring.

As you can imagine, this has been a very monumental task in creating this new agency for the State of Indiana. Although we have run into just a

few roadblocks along the way, I can tell you that the executive staff and the people that are also working for me are very pleased with the outcome as to what we are seeing up to this point.

At this time, I would like to introduce to you our investigative team that has been with us since last October with eight months under their belt, having inherited a backlog of investigations which needs to be completed. This group of 13 individuals have worked extremely hard. On average, they are completing a PD 1 investigation every 23 days, and it is taking on average three months to complete a level one from start to finish.

From looking at past results and from looking at the industry nationwide, it appears the investigators are not only working in a professional and thorough manner, but they are also working very efficiently and in a timely manner as well.

As you may remember, it was our vision to not only have people with law enforcement experience doing these investigations, but we also wanted to bring experts in the field of finance as well.

With this set up, we have five teams which we have

crossed-trained as investigators and has proven to be very successful.

If you just stand to be recognized. I know in the past you have met Garth Brown. Garth is our director of background investigations. His investigators are Larry Bostic, Angela Brooks -- Angela is on vacation, Bill Peevler, Ann Popcheff and Doug Smiley. Also, in the past you've had the opportunity to meet Jim Beebe, Jim is our director of financial investigations. His investigators are David Charlesworth, Joel DeCapua, Mike Hathaway, Glen Lloyd and Tom Piskorowski. Again, I would like to publically thank them for all the work and effort they have put forth and it's very much appreciated.

Also, working out of the investigation section is Darrell Sego. Darrell is our executive administrator who comes to us from the Indiana State Police. Darrell has a vast amount of knowledge and experience in the gaming investigations. And we appreciate Darrell being on board as well.

There are just two other individuals I would like to introduce real quickly; Sherry Green,
Sherry is my administrative secretary, and Coleta

Holmes. Coleta is the secretary to the enforcement section. Again, I thank you for being here and we appreciate all of the effort that you are doing with putting the new agency together. That's the end of my report.

I do want everyone to know my door is always open and I always take my phone calls and return my e-mails. So I will be happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Are there any questions for the superintendent? I have a question. We have a disparity study going according to Ms.

Arnold here. And when all of your people stood up, I don't see us doing what we asked other people to do. You have no minority and one lady that is in a clerical position, I guess, on your team as I see it here. So how do you feel about us as an office doing what we are asking casinos to do?

Angela Brooks, who's not here, and is also a minority. She is doing a very, very good job. I can also tell you that that is something that we are very sensitive to throughout the entire hiring process. And I can also tell you I do have the pictures coming from the recruit class of the 19 individuals from the Majestic Star 1 and II; and

out of the 19 individuals, over half of them are women or minority.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR ARNOLD: Mr. Chairman, may I add, we have also hired a consulting firm to help us increase our recruitment of minorities and women. We also recognize it's been a great challenge and we, obviously, have not been able to address it to our satisfaction.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: I appreciate that. I know we all believe in the all American team, we are all Americans here. And as well as if you visit these casinos, the patrons are significantly minority oriented. So we have a whole bunch of other people, police and other minority folk out there, and that is something we need to look at.

Any other questions?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: May I add one thing? Although -- I'm not in disagreement with you, Mr. Chair, but I do want to point out, the disparity study is not about employment goals. The disparity study is only about purchasing goods and services. They are two separate issues, but that doesn't mean -- I still agree with you, but the disparity study would have nothing to do with hiring practices.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: I thought I had a pretty good understanding of what the disparity study was, I appreciate you clearing it up for me.

Any old business?

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: No, Mr. Chair, there is no old business.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: New business?

emergency rules we are proposing to you. In three weeks congratulations will be in order, you will become the proud parents of charity gaming. And we have offered positions to two individuals to help us in performing these responsibilities. These positions have been approved by the Department of Personnel and they are presently pending over in the office of management and budget.

First of all, we have asked to be our director of charity gaming Mr. Mark Mitchell. Mark comes to us from the Department of Revenue. He's presently the director of their Criminal Investigation

Department Division. And, ironically, in his first life he was an Indiana State Police officer as a lieutenant with the gaming commission, in charge of all of the enforcement officers on the boat. Thank you, Mark.

Secondly, we have asked Diane Freeman to be our director of compliance and licensing. Diane comes, also, from the Indiana Department of Revenue and probably has a record of 28 years of service there. And while Diane has been an expert in almost all aspects of the Department of Revenue, she has always been attached to charity gaming since it began in 1992, and is considered an upmost expert in that field.

We have executed a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Revenue which allows Diane and Mark to work out of our offices for about two weeks now. And they have been assisting us in preparation of the transfer to us.

However, some time ago the Department of
Revenue undertook to rewrite its regulations that
pertain to charity gaming, somewhat like we are
doing now, to conform with the actual practices of
regulating the entities in the industry. One of
those particular regulations included a 10 percent
assessment against gross proceeds of a qualified
organization. As a result of that one regulation,
litigation ensued and the Court had determined that
the Department of Revenue had failed to
procedurally comply with the rule making process

and it invalidated their attempt to promulgate new rules.

2.0

After words, the Department of Revenue -- we started the process to finish but never quite did, so we are faced with a series of inadequate rules for us to be able to appropriately regulate charity gaming. So our legal department, with the assistance of Mark and Diane, reviewed those proposed rules and pulled those out that only will affect charity gaming in the fashion in which it's being regulated today, and will not be changing anything dramatically, at all, in the process of the practice of what revenue is doing as to what we will do after the July 1st deadline.

Now, there is one exception. The prior law had an event that specifically allowed us what they refer to as water races. And some of you may have heard them referred to as rubber duck races. What that entails is where -- a qualified organization will have an event where people will purchase a numbered rubber duck. And literally hundreds of these are released into a body of water at the same time. And there is a predetermined spot downstream that the first rubber duck that passes wins. And although they are not used extensively in the State

of Indiana, those qualified organizations which do support these and sponsor these do rely on their revenues for their charitable purposes.

Representative Webstone removed that from the bill and asserted a provision that allows the commission to approve new gaming events. It was his feeling that the members of the legislature had probably a limited amount of time to consider issues and considering new games by charity gaming was one he did not see as a priority and saw better vested with this body. So during the process of Senate Bill 100, I assured those people who were very interested in water races that as far as we saw, we would have no hesitation but to recommend its adoption at our very first meeting.

The law as written in 100 allows us to make rules prior to July 1st. In order to do so, we have sat down with their counsel and copied language from the original statute that is also included in this emergency rule. So in essence, it's reaffirming the practice that has existed in revenue as far as regulating charitable gaming, with the addition of approving water races, which, in fact, they are approved today, July 1st it will go out. In fact, some have already been scheduled

and revenue has been kind enough to give them a number because it's required for them to put their number on their adversements when they advertise for it, although it will happen after July 1st. So we would respectfully ask the commission for positive approval for the request for the emergency rule on charity gaming.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You've heard the recommendation from the executive director regarding resolution 2006-24, emergency rule regarding conduct of charity gaming under Indiana Code 4-32.2.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I have just a couple of general questions. What is the organizational structure of this new entity that we have?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: We don't have one.

We are in the process of developing one. The agreement was made in the very beginning, and we're honoring it now. There are certain employees in the Department of Revenue who are solely paid through charitable gaming money. Maybe I should preface this, all of these expenses come out of charity gaming and will not come out of our budget at all. We will have a new budget. The agreement was that no state individual will lose his or her

job as a result of this transfer.

Mark and Diane are in the process right now of identifying those individuals. Then when they are totally identified -- we have sent them a list Monday or Tuesday, and John Eckert, who is their executive director, is in Arkansas all week and we were hoping to get an e-mail back by Friday so we would know. We are looking at two basic divisions; one would be the enforcement division and one would be the licensing and compliance division. We are looking at maybe anywhere around 16 to 18 additional employees.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. But you are going to be the executive director of the whole --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Yes

Structurally, Mark will be on the same level as Phil, Jenny and Kevin.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Does he get paid three times the salary, then?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: He's worth every penny of it.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Figure out what those three make and that's what you should get. I will back you on it. Okay.

That's interesting. I saw this coming. I was

talking a little bit ago about Columbia Sussex. If that doesn't pan out in Evansville, the whining we would have to listen to. All of us know people involved in church, bingos, and raffles, and this and that. And my sister has already bugged me about this. I told her to call Indianapolis or the attorneys who gets paid to represent the Catholic Diocese in Evansville. So this will be interesting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Bear in mind,
Mr. Vowels, I did not raise my hand to volunteer
the commission on this issue.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: There was talk of this over the years. It makes sense if the State of Indiana started yesterday, I guess. I understand your difficulty with it and I don't envy you, what you have got to deal with.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I don't have anything further. I would have a motion to approve --

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: A second?

COMMISSIONER FESCO: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: It's been moved in second that Resolution 2006-26 be passed.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Excuse me. Mr.

Chair, that's 2006-24, for the record.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Yes, I'm sorry, 2006-24.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Next is 2006-25. In following up what Commissioner Vowels just said, after July 1st we will be solely responsible for the license and regulating, at least last year, in excess of 2600 charity gaming license. Now, we are focused in making this transition as seamless as possible and we want to make sure that the customer service that the commission provides is extremely user friendly. Although we are approaching, like I indicated, sort of a lift and drop, because we don't have the time to redevelop the wheel here or reinvent the wheel, we are fully aware there is going to be some really unexpected issues that will arise to the commission that we have not been able to anticipate.

So in anticipation of this occurring, the legislature did provide in the act that the commission could delegate the executive authority -- direct executive authority to fulfill the regulatory and statutory responsibilities of the

commission. And in order for us to get this up and running by the 1st of July, we feel we would like to ask for an emergency rule, and if you would do so, where you would authorize the executive director to act on behalf of the commission in regards to charity gaming so we do not have to have special meeting after special meeting in order to meet all of these goals.

I do assure you that I do not expect this to be a blanket permanent grant of authority. As we see issues that we think are substantive policy issues, that those would not be determined as long as we have time to bring them before the commission. But until we are up and running, we are asking for latitude and authority to be able to act as necessary for us to acquire this jurisdiction. Accordingly, we are asking your favor in consideration of Resolution 2006-25 which does so.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: The executive director of charity gaming and there was one over at the Department of Revenue; is that right?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Not actually. Their structure is very strange.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: They didn't have a board

of people to roll into and ask a bunch of annoying questions?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: No, they did not have a board.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. I have read what you prepared here. Again, I don't envy you. thought is that this gives you blanket ability to do what you need to do because a lot of these things are going to be very significant and come up in a very quick amount of time that has to be addressed. And maybe it's not reinventing the wheel but it's pretty close to it. I think what I would feel more comfortable with is if this granted the executive director to exercise all gaming powers and duties inferred upon this commission by that Senate Enrolled Act. If we granted it until July 1, 2007, and then revisited it next spring if you need an extension rather than just a complete confirming of all of those powers. Maybe I'm out of line.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: No, I think that's very reasonable. I would hope by that point in time I would understand what I feel like I should have the responsibility for and what the commission should.

1 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Does your salary get 2 doubled for doing this? 3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Unfortunately not. 4 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: This isn't working out 5 for anybody. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: 6 7 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: As a follow-up to that 8 question, as I understand the legislation, there is 9 authority to begin work prior to July 1. Should 10 the effective date of this authority granted to you 11 be today rather than July 1 of '06; is there a 12 reason to wait? 13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It should be 14 today. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Section 4 on the back 15 16 page. Do you have a problem with having authority 17 starting today? 18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I would like it 19 today. I see that, July 1. 20 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Yes, we will have to 21 change that. 22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It needs to be 23 today. Thank you, Commissioner Barrett. 24 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: That would have been a

25

nice surprise.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Oh, it sure would be.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Then what I would propose is beginning June 7, 2006 and July 1, 2007.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Is that a motion?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will make the motion in reference to that.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: It's been moved to second.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

(NONE OPPOSED)

1.0

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Members of the commission, I'm going to address six resolutions. The first two involve emergency rules. Resolution 2006-26 would approve an emergency rule that -- as a waiver provision to 68 IAC 1-7-1, which would permit the commission or the executive director to waive on a case-by-case basis the rules of general prohibition against weapons on board a riverboat. The emergency rule also deletes any references to the term "excursion," which has become an obsolete term since the introduction of dockside gaming in Indiana.

I understand the emergency rule you've received in your packets may not have been entirely

clear on the two things that this emergency rule We are actually making very few changes to the regulations in itself, those are the only two changes. The proposed waiver provisions derive primarily from an issue that has come up recently, which is the fact that the Indiana riverboats -most of them hire outside companies to bring on board the vessels and service the ATMs large amounts of cash. And those companies are insured by insurance companies that require the people that carry that cash to also carry a firearm or weapon as a means to protect those assets. So the weapons prohibition that exist in the current rule has created a large burden not only on the riverboats and the ATM companies but also on riverboat personnel, security personnel, Indiana State Police, and our gaming agents who, at times, has been required to provide armed escorts for several hours at a time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So this waiver that is being proposed is not a blanket approval of ATM service companies or anyone to carry a firearm on board, its simply adds an explicit waiver provision which under certain circumstances could be used by the executive director or the commission to allow companies to

carry a firearm. The resolution also finds that the need for this proposed emergency rule is immediate and substantial, such that regular rule-making procedures would be inaccurate to address the need, that the emergency rule would address the need. So commission staff recommends that you approve Resolution 2006-27. Any questions? Excuse me, Resolution 2006-26.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: If there are no questions --

1 4

2.0

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I do have a question.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: The requirement that the courier be licensed to carry a firearm, what would be the permitting authority; a license under Indiana law or --

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. Mr. Barrett.

question, and it's not one that I can answer easily, because I know of at least one company, an Illinois company, that comes to the northern Indiana riverboats. And in Illinois they are not required to carry a firearm license to do this job. So that's something that this resolution doesn't address. It's an issue that the commissioner or the executive director will have to address before

granting a waiver.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: In your opinion, does the resolution, by its terms, require that the person -- each individual person have a current license by the state or by the federal government?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: To carry a firearm?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Yes.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I would not say that this resolution requires that. I'm not sure if the law requires it, to be honest. I'm not sure if Indiana law would require an ATM company from Illinois to work in Indiana without its individuals having a firearms permit in Indiana, but it's something, obviously, we have to check on.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I didn't mean to say that they would have to have one from Indiana.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: But the law in Indiana is that a person other than a law enforcement officer, judicial officer, which is to carry a firearm, he or she has to be licensed, whether that license is from another state or from this state.

I guess my question is whether -- regardless of the company, the individual who actually has the weapon and has the money would have been licensed by a

state licensing agent or by the federal government, and will that license be current?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: If that's the rule of the commission. We will do whatever the law requires in Indiana before we issue a waiver to allow that. If that is, indeed, the law in Indiana, then that is what we will require before we issue a waiver.

in Illinois and he's got a gun, he can legally carry that gun, and he comes across the border to Indiana, and he's not here in the capacity of this, but the fact that he has a license in his own state and he gets stopped by the police and they don't -- he's not charged with carrying a handgun without a permit because he has an Illinois license, I would assume that Illinois has some sort of licensing mechanism for guns for their citizens and if a security officer comes across the border and comes and gets the money, then everything is kosher; is that --

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I would assume. I think there is also a provision -- we started to research this but we haven't been able to finish.

I think there is an exception for what is called an

express company. And these companies might fall under that definition and, therefore, not be required to hold a license. So that's something that we begun to explore, but --

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: But express companies typically have bonds. Are ATMs bonded?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: The companies we have looked at are bonded.

Question is that the people who are currently allowed to have weapons on board a vessel are people who have been through a process that a law enforcement officer has to go through. People who are hired by a private company, if there is some loophole legally in Indiana law that would allow those people not to be vetted by a governmental agency, whether it be the Indiana State Police or agency or one of the other state or federal agencies, I would have to have a significant level of confidence in their company that did the vetting before I would sign off on the idea of those people having a weapon on a boat.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Understood.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I'm not sure the resolution grasps that concept.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Sure. The resolution is merely intended to grant the executive director or the commission authority to grant waivers. And I guess what I'm presuming in the resolution is that we follow the law and that we set up a series of standards that have to be met before any company has been granted a waiver. And that's what has not been developed yet. So if you prefer to have, as a part of such a resolution, a series of steps which the commission would have to consider before granting a waiver, we could wait. But what I'm presenting today is that we do not grant such a waiver until that vetting process was developed.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Commissioner Barrett, is your concern for the safety of the people -- I mean, is that where you're coming from? I'm trying to figure it out. My thought is if one of the gaming companies handed over a lot of money to a company, their vetting process is probably more efficient than ours. But where are you coming from on the concern about the suspenders approach?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Well, I don't know if it has dealt with suspenders, because I don't know what I'm talking about is suspenders. Beyond that,

yes -- to answer your question, yes, I'm concerned about the safety of anybody within the range of that weapon.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: One of the reasons that this has come up is that it seems like the casinos are the only places of business where these people are not allowed to go with their weapons. They can walk into a bank, into our building in Indiana, and this is just meant to address that. Additionally, the removal of the word "excursion" from this rule also would add a little bit of context, because when the weapons prohibition was first drafted in these regulations, the assumption was that you want to prevent people getting on board of these boats that are going out on -- in the river for a cruise and not being able to get at that riverboat or the people on there if something were to happen with these weapons. Now that we are docksided and removing the word "excursion" here, we are preventing these weapons from being on, basically, in a building. And it's creating a situation where these express companies, for lack of a better word, are not able to conduct their business in one place and that is casinos.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: How long has the excursion been removed? How long has it gone to

dockside?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: 2002 is what Jenny is telling me. I don't know the exact date.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR ARNOLD: The operators probably know better than I.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: 2003.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Mr. Barrett, let me ask you a question. What would be the difference in these guys coming on the boat with a weapon than the same guys going into a bank or to a grocery store to pick up money and take them?

commissioner barrett: Well, sitting in this seat, the immediate answer -- and I'm not trying to be flippant, but the immediate answer is that this commission has no authority over banks and grocery stores. I'm mindful of our obligation and integrity, and within the integrity I include bodily safety of the people involved. All I'm trying to ask counsel is the scope of the waiver, for lack of a better term, and he answered that question for me. I don't have any further questions on that point.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Phill, that section 2 of

the public rule document, does that mean that if we adopted this resolution -- well, I know this thing has to go through all the process of being one of our many regulations, but if we adopted this resolution, does that mean next week that they can take the gun onto the boat and pick up the money?

It doesn't have to wait until this is through --

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: It means if the executive director or the commission wanted to grant a waiver next week, then a companies employee could. This does nothing. All it does is grant authority.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Grant the waiver.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Grant the waiver, yes.

This is not an express or blanket approval for companies to come on board. It simply sets up a system by which the commission can allow it.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. So it's been almost three years since the dockside. So essentially, they have had this problem for the last three years?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Yes. We are trying to get to the bottom of what has happened --

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Do they wait until another boat goes by?

2.0

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I don't know if I want to ask.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I guess the question I have and if -- it lays liability on the casino companies, if my assumption is correct. I don't

have and if -- it lays liability on the casino companies, if my assumption is correct. I don't assume, though, a few weeks ago you laid awake at night and think, well, boy, these poor guys can't carry guns on the boat. Did someone else bring this to your attention?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Oh, yes.

1.3

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Was it the gaming company?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: It was a situation that arose at one of the riverboats, yes.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What I'm trying to say here is if we agree to this and somebody got a job with one of these companies and goes in and shoots somebody, I want the casinos to be sued because it's their idea; is that where we are standing here?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: It's now on the record.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I'm always concerned about public safety but I'm concerned about liability, too. I have no real problem with what

you have written up here.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Phill, I have a quick question. From a practical standpoint, do you plan on exercising the authority?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: In a practical sense, personally, I would think that a casino is a place of business that is not necessarily so different from anywhere else where these people enter to do their jobs. As long as the company undergoes sufficient vetting process, then they should be allowed to carry weapons on a riverboat rather than have some sort of protection from the state.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: What part of the process -- in other words, what part of the process, doing a background on a specific company that is granted the waiver?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: No. Then I believe liability might attach. You know, it's more like requiring a company to set forth what they do, assumption that those steps would be followed. And if they are, then these people would be able to carry a weapon on board.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You heard the request of "Resolution 2006-26, A Resolution Adopting An Emergency Rule Regarding Weapons On A Riverboat."

What is your pleasure -- need a motion.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Move it to be approved as written.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move second to Resolution 2006-26 be approved.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

(NONE OPPOSED)

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: The next resolution

2006-27 involving another emergency rule regarding
gaming agents. If approved, this resolution would
adopt an emergency rule which does three things.

First, it defines the terms "enforcement agent" and
"gaming agent" which are not currently in the
regulations. Second, it removes and replaces
references to an obsolete term "commission agent"
throughout Title 68. Third, it amends the
regulations which addresses in a way -- excuse me.

It amends the portion of the regulation which
addresses reinversable (sic) expenses for the
Indiana State Police in a manner which includes the
gaming agents.

Due, in part, to the fact that the commission's gaming agents have already been placed on Majestic Star I and II riverboats, and that before the

1 commission next meets we will have at least three 2 more riverboats fully staffed by gaming agents. 3 This resolution also finds that the need for the 4 proposed emergency rules immediate and substantial 5 such as a regular rulemaking procedures would be 6 inadequate to address the stated need and that the 7 emergency rule would be likely to address that 8 need. With that background, the staff recommends 9 that you approve Resolution 2006-27. 10 COMMISSIONER CALLOWAY: Any questions of Phil 11 on Resolution 2006-27? Now we're going to 12 entertain a motion to accept the recommendation. 13 Approve Resolution 2006-27? 14 COMMISSIONER MURPHY: So move. 15 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Second. 16 COMMISSIONER CALLOWAY: All of those in favor, 17 let me know by a vote sign of aye. 18 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) COMMISSIONER CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 19 2.0 (NONE) 21 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: 2006-28 deals with 22 various bagging requirements and procedures that currently exist in the regulations, specifically at 2.3 24 68 IAC 2-3. If approved, this resolution would

waive any requirement or procedure in that rule

which might be construed to do three things.

1.5

First, any prohibition against the issuance of a single identification badge serve as a riverboat employee's temporary and permanent gaming license.

Second, anything in the regulation which would require the issuance of a separate and distinct temporary versus permanent identification badge.

Third, anything in the regulation which would require an employee's identification badge to display the dates on which the person's occupational license was granted -- excuse me, issued or the date on which it would expire.

As a recommendation of your staff, the issuance of separate identification badges for temporary and permanent licensees is actually an unnecessary and inefficient practice which burdens the commission's enforcement agents by forcing them to process the licenses and badges twice and takes away from their ability to spend time in law enforcement and regulatory functions that are supposed to be their primary concern.

The staff proposes a gradual implementation of this single badge system for temporary and personal occupational licensees in a way that would make this resolution apply only to riverboats on which

the gaming agents have replaced the Indiana State Police.

2.3

If you have no further questions, the commission staff recommends that you approve Resolution 2006-28.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will move to approve.

MR. MURPHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: It's been ruled in the second that we approve Resolution 2006-28. All those in favor let me know by a vote of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?
(NONE)

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: 2006-29 applies to individuals who are seeking an occupational license to work on or for multiple riverboats, where those riverboats are owned by a common ultimate parent.

The commission's current regulations may be interpreted as prohibiting a Level I licensee from managing the gambling operations of more than one riverboat, even where those riverboats have a common ultimate owner.

Additionally, current regulations and procedures require occupational licensees with job responsibilities associated with multiple

riverboats to undergo a full licensing procedure at each riverboat, thus requiring multiple applications, multiple application fees, and multiple annual licensing fees.

If approved, the resolution would authorize the executive director to waive, upon request of an occupational licensee or a riverboat licensee, any regulations in 68 IAC 2-3 which -- for the purpose of allowing occupational licensees seeking to work for more than one riverboat to do three things.

One, perform job duties pertaining to the management of gambling operations for two such riverboats.

Two, to submit only one application, one application fee, one annual fee, and be subjected only to one initial licensing investigation. So that's two things and not three things.

With that background, the commission staff recommends approval of this resolution.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

GENERAL COUNSEL: If approved, Resolution

2006-30 would authorize the executive director to

waive all or part of the regulations and procedures

in 68 IAC 4-1-6 and 4-1-7, requiring certain
riverboat and supplier licensees to file multiple
copies of various documents that they have filed
with the Security and Exchange Commission.

It is the opinion of the commission staff that

greater efficiencies can be achieved by allowing our financial and background investigators to track this information and these documentations through various electronic means that the SEC or other third-party service venders offer.

Commission staff recommends approval of 2006-30.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So you will still be getting this information but just not --

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Not the paper, yeah.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Any questions regarding Resolution 2006-30? If no, we will entertain a motion to approve staff's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I'll move to approve.

MR. MURPHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. All those in favor, let me know by a vote of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

2 4

2.0

1

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: If approved, Resolution 2006-31 will authorize the executive director to issue temporary supplier licenses to qualified applicants. Although this function has been traditionally handled by the full commission, the staff believes that given the large amount of time that passes between meetings, it would be more efficient to handle granting of temporary supplier licenses at staff level, especially in light of the fact that the commission already does this for all occupational licensees and the fact that we expect an influx of new supplier applications, given the fact that the commission recently adopted and fully promulgated a rule which allows digital surveillance technology to be placed on the riverboats. And we've received a number of inquiries from potential supplier licensees who will need to be licensed for that.

Pursuant to the resolution prior to issuing a temporary license, the executive director would be required to determine that a preliminary investigation has been completed and that the investigation had not revealed any information which would prevent a finding of suitability.

The resolution also requires that the executive

director will report all incidences of granting of 1 a temporary supplier license at the next scheduled 2 3 business meeting. 4 With that, we recommend approval of Resolution 2006-31. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: We had an explanation of 7 Resolution 2006-31 by the staff. Are there any 8 questions? If not, we will entertain a motion to 9 accept the staff's recommendation. 10 COMMISSIONER: So moved. 11 COMMISSIONER: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. All of 13 those in favor, let it be known by a vote of the 14 sign of aye. 15 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 16 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 17 (NONE) 18 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. Moving on, 19 Angie Bunton. 20 ANGIE BUNTON: Good afternoon. You have before 21 you five orders regarding the voluntary exclusion 22 program, John Doe #4, John Doe #5, 23 John Doe #6, John Doe #7 and John Doe #8. Pursuant 24 to the rules, all participants must remain

confidential. Pursuant to 68 IAC 6-3-2(g), a

participant in the program agrees that if he or she violates the terms of the program and enters the gaming facility under the jurisdiction of the Commission agrees to forfeit any jackpot or thing of value won as a result of a wager.

Under order 2006-32, John Doe #4 won \$2,313.90 at Argosy Casino. Argosy withheld the winnings as required by Commission regulations. Commission staff recommends that you approve the remittance of these winnings as a fine levied against John Doe #4.

Under order 2006-33, John Doe #5 won \$1,350.

And under order 2006-34, John Doe #6 won \$1,557 at

Horseshoe Casino. Horseshoe withheld the winnings,
as required by Commission regulations.

Commission staff recommends you approve remittance of these winnings as fines levied against John Doe #5 and John Doe #6.

Under order 2006-35, John Doe #7 won \$1,285 at Majestic Star Casino and Majestic Star withheld the winnings as required by Commission regulations.

Commission staff recommends that you approve the remittance as a fine levied against John Doe #7.

Under order 2006-36, John Doe #8 won \$4,500 at

1 Resorts East Chicago. Resorts withheld the 2 winnings as required by Commission regulations. 3 Commission staff recommends that you approve the remittance of these winnings as fines levied 4 5 against John Doe #8. CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You've heard the 6 7 recommendation of the staff regarding order 2006-32 8 through order 2006-37. Any questions? If not, the 9 Chair will entertain a motion to accept staff's recommendation. 10 11 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will move to accept. 12 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: By going through only 13 number 8, we only got to 36, not 37. 14 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I think you are right. 15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: That is correct. 16 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What do you think, Angie? 17 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: You covered 32 through 18 36; right? 19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Did you intend to 2.0 leave 37 out? 21 ANGIE BUNTON: Nine is a separate issue. 22 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: So let me ask for a motion 23 for order 2006-32 through 2006-36? 24 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I move.

Second.

25

MR. MURPHY:

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Moves to second. 1 All of 2 those in favor, let me know by a vote of aye. 3 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 4 5 (NONE) 6 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You have number 9 now; 7 right? 8 ANGIE BUNTON: Right. You have before you an 9 order regarding the voluntary exclusion program and 10 John Doe #9. Pursuant to the rules of the program, 11 the identity of the individual must remain 12 confidential. 13 On November 17, 2005, the commission approved 14 an order concerning John Doe #9 remitting the 15 jackpot at Argosy Casino. This order approved 16 remittance of the jackpot through the commission as 17 a fine levied against John Doe #9. 18 On November 18, 2005, the commission sent a 19 letter to John Doe #9 advising him of the 20 Commission's order and his rights to appeal. 2.1 On December 5, 2005, a letter was received from 22 John Doe #9 appealing the Commission's order and 23 requesting a hearing. The appeal was submitted to 24 an Administrative Law Judge. Prior to the hearing

being conducted, the Commission moved for a summary

judgment which was granted and the hearing was vacated. The Administrative Law Judge found that John Doe #9 was lawfully under the voluntary exclusion list and that his jackpot was properly levied as a fine against him.

The commission staff recommends that you adopt the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I have only one question. The document that we have in front of us, the proposed findings, the exact document, is that document public documents or confidential? The reason I ask, if you take a look at the distribution list, John Doe is listed by name.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: What document is that?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: From March 30th.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: That's from the ALJ? EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Did you bring any

Wite-out with you?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I guess for a preliminary matter, I would vote to approve the recommendation and vote, also, to remove -- also the distribution list be redacted to comply with the regulations.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. You heard the motion from Commissioner Barrett. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. Been moved to second that order 2006-37 be approved with the amendments as indicated. All of those in favor, let me know by a vote sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you.

Okay. We are going to take a couple of minutes break here. We have two fellows up here I know that's over 50 and we have to have a break every hour.

(AT THIS TIME THERE WAS A BRIEF RECESS TAKEN, AFTER WHICH THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HAD:)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Just a little bit of an adjustment to the commissioners. We did not approve the minutes when we started because we were one shy. So at this time the Chair will entertain a motion to approve the minutes from our previous Don can't make the motion and I will meeting. second because he wasn't there. All those in favor, let me know by a vote of sign of aye.

(COMMISSIONER MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

1 (NONE) 2 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, for the 3 record, I will excuse on that oath since I was not 4 a member at the time. 5 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: And if the record will 6 reflect the same thing with me, because I wasn't 7 there. 8 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: In addition, we had a 9 couple of commissioners that came in after we 10 started and I would like them to introduce 11 themselves at this time. 12 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Thank you for the 13 notice here. 14 MR. MURPHY: No, I'm actually Tim Murphy. 15 MR. FESKO: I was for a moment. 16 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: I'm Bryan Robinson, 17 Vice Chairman from Greenville. 18 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you. 19 Okay. Let's get back to the task at hand. 20 Adam Packer. 21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. ADAM PACKER: 22 be presenting the exclusion list development since 23 the last commission meeting. Also, a little bit of 24 an introduction, I guess. I think I was introduced

in absentia at the last commission meeting.

at the law enforcement academy participating in the the gaming training for gaming agents. So it's nice to meet you -- actually, hi, nice to meet you.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What's your name again?

ADAM PACKER: Adam Packer.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: And you work for us; is that right?

ADAM PACKER: That's right.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: He's a member of the legal staff.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Can you tell us a little about yourself?

ADAM PACKER: Sure. I was born in a small town -- no. Okay.

First, on the exclusion list there is only one matter before you, the exclusion of Robert Wilson. This has just gone to an Administrative Law Judge on November 9th. Mr. Wilson was observed in the past posting bets at Belterra Casino in 2004. The executive director took action on May 6, 2005 to exclude him from riverboat gambling facilities. He petitioned for a hearing. The hearing was held November 9, 2005 at the Belterra Casino. The ALJ submitted her Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law on March 1, 2006. Those were attached, I

1 believe, in your packets.

The commission staff is recommending that the commission affirm the finding of the ALJ and issue an order to that effect.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: What did you say he did? What did Rob Wilson do?

ADAM PACKER: He was past posting his bets, which means that he was adding money or putting a bet onto the gaming table after the outcome of the game had already been determined.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Oh.

ADAM PACKER: I believe it was roulette. And after the ball had gone into -- after the dice had set, he was dropping chips on the table.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: They won't let you get away with that in a casino.

ADAM PACKER: Unfortunately, he was caught.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Unfortunately for him.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Yeah. Do you have a recommendation regarding Robert Wilson, order 2006-38; what's your pleasure?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I move to -- it appears that we would be affirming the Findings of Facts by the ALJ, and I will move to affirm the exclusion of Robert Wilson.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: May I ask a question? How long is the exclusion for?

ADAM PACKER: It's permanent.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. All of those in favor, let me know by a vote of aye.

(COMMISSIONER MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Adam?

ADAM PACKER: Okay. Moving on to the next matter; occupational matters. There have been some changes to the list since the packets were mailed. Michael McEnelly, who is the third item on the list for 2006-41 -- it was a settlement agreement, but Mr. McEnelly has not ever returned the signed copy of the settlement agreement so we will put it off until the next commission meeting.

In addition, Gary Johnson, who's order is 2006-43, and Jimmy Verta, who's order was 2006-44, have been taken off the schedule. So those matters will not come before the commission today.

First, the occupational license matter that is coming before you today is Monique Johnson. She obtained a permanent occupational license prior to a full investigation of her application being

completed because of what we assumed was a glitch in the occupational licensing system. She had failed to disclose a previous felony conviction on her application. Once we discovered that, we took action to discipline her license. We filed a complaint and submitted it to the Administrative Law Judge. During the pendency of the hearing, before a hearing was actually held, Ms. Johnson was terminated from her employment, and so I moved the ALJ to withdraw our complaint. The ALJ issued and recommended an order granting our motion to withdraw the complaint, disciplinary action. And I ask you today to approve that ALJ order and enter an order to that effect.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Is there any way she can get a job at another place other than Majestic Star where this will pop up?

ADAM PACKER: It will pop up. The fact that she was terminated from her employment will come up, obviously. And then if she were to get a job at another casino, she would have to file a complete application. The glitch has been fixed in the occupational licensing system. And, also, we know about the felony conviction now, so she would not get a license if she was to apply for another

1 one somewhere down the road. 2 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What was the glitch and 3 how is it caught now? ADAM PACKER: I was not employed with the 4 5 commission when the glitch existed. Му 6 understanding is that it would move a person's 7 application to the permanent licensing step in the 8 process without any intermediate steps. There were 9 one or two people who got occupational licenses 10 without investigations being completed. I believe 11 Ms. Johnson is the last of the bunch to be fixed. 12 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I don't have any other 13 questions. 14 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You heard the report regarding Monique Johnson, order 2006-39. 15 16 have a motion to approve the ALJs recommendation? 17 COMMISSIONER MURPHY: So move. 18 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Moved by Tim. 19 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: All those in favor, let me 21 know by aye. 22 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 23 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 24 (NONE) 25 The next occupational license

ADAM PACKER:

matter will be 2006-40, Adam Combs. Mr. Combs on December 5, 2005, notified the commission about an arrest that occurred on December 24, 2004. This was a misdemeanor charge. He was under an obligation to inform us within 10 days of that arrest. Under the regulations, he, obviously, did not do so. It was almost a year later that he informed the commission about that arrest. He admitted to the commission staff that he knew that he had an obligation to disclose the arrest and still failed to do so.

We have negotiated a settlement agreement, prior to taking this in front of ALJ, for a two-day unpaid suspension as a result of his failure to disclose a misdemeanor arrest. At this point, we would recommend the commission to approve that settlement agreement.

 ${\tt COMMISSIONER\ VOWELS:} \quad {\tt I\ will\ move\ to\ approve.}$

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Why two days, are you trying to send a message to this individual -- a suspension for two days?

ADAM PACKER: Yes. It's to send a message.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: There are a couple of factors to consider in a case like this. This is something that we think is actually prevalent,

1.5

failure to report these types of things. We have made an effort to get all of the riverboats to communicate will all the occupational licensees and remind them that they have an obligation to tell the staff when they have been arrested within 10 days.

2.0

So we look at two things, the underlined offense -- here it is a misdemeanor, so it really has nothing to do with his suitability for a license. We also look at how long it took them to actually report the arrest and whether they knew about their obligation. So from a point of about two months ago, I believe, when a subsequent reminder went out to all occupational licensees. And we now consider every occupational licensee in Indiana to at least be aware of this obligation. And this is one of the additional ones. And he claims to not know and that's one of the factors we took into the two days.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: What is the range of sanctions that is available?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: Unlimited but for monetary fines. We cannot fine an occupational licensee. We can do virtually anything we like.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Go ahead, Mr. Robinson.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: To his knowledge of the 10-day requirement of notification, he admitted that he knew at that time or later?

ADAM PACKER: I don't remember when -- if he knew at the time that he was arrested that he needed to do it or if he knew it sometime later on. Do you remember, Andrew?

ANDREW KLINGER: If I may jump in. In this particular case, I believe Mr. Combs was not necessarily aware of his duty to report it at the time he was arrested. However, he subsequently -essentially admitted in a letter to us that he was aware that this policy had been posted. I think this was maybe in November of last year. But he still, subsequently, did not report the offense until later during his renewal period, which was more than a month after he was aware of the policy. So at the time he reported, it he was aware of the policy and it was still well beyond the 10-day period.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: When a licensee goes to work on a casino boat, does the operator ever require that notification of that policy be given to employees when they are hired; do you know?

ADAM PACKER: It is now posted in the human resource office and other places where the employees would be.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: So they don't necessarily get a hard copy?

ANDREW KLINGER: It's also posted right outside the office of the gaming agent, which is where the badges are processed and the employees are processed.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: So this guy had every opportunity?

ANDREW KLINGER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Was he surprised when his relicensing came up -- was that the first time he brought it to anybody's attention?

ADAM PACKER: That was when he first brought it to our attention. And I think he brought it to our attention by notifying the gaming agent on board the boat and then it was passed back to us. So it's not like we found out through the gaming agent, he did volunteer the information. But after a significant delay.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Does the notification requirement include something like a traffic ticket or arrest?

ANDREW KLINGER: I don't believe it does. I
think it's just misdemeanors.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: It does not include
that.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: The bottom line is he
committed a misdemeanor offense of criminal

2.1

committed a misdemeanor offense of criminal recklessness on Christmas Eve. Does alcohol have anything to do with it?

ADAM PACKER: I don't have the court paperwork.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Is the disciplinary

proceeding for the offense or for failure to

report?

ADAM PACKER: For the failure to report. The severity of the offense is actually consciously not taken into consideration when determining the violation unless it were to be a felony, which would then render him unsuitable for a license.

Because the violation of the regulation stems from his failure to report and not from the misdemeanor offense. That's what our obligation is.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Does the jurisdiction extend sanctions for misdemeanors?

ADAM PACKER: For misdemeanors, no. Just for a felony.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I don't want to spend too

much time on it, but I just want to understand. So if an occupational licensee commits battery on a patron right outside the boat, that might be -- reflect his ability to conduct his job. Now, if he doesn't get fired, that's a different question. But we would not be able to look at that, the facts of that offense, in determining appropriate sanctions?

ADAM PACKER: In determining appropriate sanctions for a violation of a failure to report, no, but his license could be at risk for his character -- you know, the acts that would impugn his character.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: So it could be gotten to through another procedural mechanism?

ADAM PACKER: That's my recollection.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I understand.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, we need to determine if someone is being not forthright in an application working on one of these properties in Indiana, is this a suitable punishment, where someone else knows they have made the same disclosure a two-day suspension, that is scary. That is a determination we need to make, because failure to notify of a

situation like this is a very important material fact. As the gentleman down the table said, we are trying to clean this up, other abuses. We need to determine if two days is suitable or not. I'm not inclined to agree that it is.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Well -- Mr. Vowels motioned and I would second it, anyway.

So how did you come by the two days?

ADAM PACKER: There was an extensive discussion among the three of us, as I remember. I think there was a concern that a harsher sentence which was considered by commission staff -- in many cases, because these people have low incomes would be a significant fine and could push them into bankruptcy or push them into financial situations. That's something that we didn't feel, as staff, that a failure to report would justify that severe of a financial punishment.

There was a discussion sometime in the future enacting a system of monetary fines for this, but we currently don't have that authority. So we have to get to the discipline through this process and this, in our opinion, was the fairest way to do it, bouncing both the severity of the punishment toward the person, impacting their life in a negative way

for something that -- it's not a critical regulatory violation.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: I tend to agree with you, a lot of these individuals are on the lower end of the social economic ladder, I guess. And to take two or three days from them would make a difference, I think, in their lives.

ADAM PACKER: That was our conclusion.

CENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: The other thing to consider here, this person is a Level 3 licensee, the lowest level. He's a janitor, if I remember right. His job merely required this person to walk on the riverboat. That's why he is licensed. And so when we come up with penalties like this, we also consider the level of licensure. This person does not handle money. He, basically, cleans up. He needs to walk on the boat. So that's a factor we took into consideration.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Let me close the loop on what I started to ask earlier. You addressed this in your opening comment. The severity of the underlying offense is or is not related to an A misdemeanor -- or arrested for an A misdemeanor, or didn't report it in 10 days; do you look at all at the severity of the underlying offense because

there are misdemeanors and there are misdemeanors.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: My conclusion would be that, yes, you look at the severity of the underlying offense. When determining a settlement negotiation whether we could actually take that into account when we take this to an ALJ in a formal complaint, I'm not so sure what the ALJ would say. But if we're negotiating a settlement agreement, we need to take that into consideration. And that's what we did here. It never reached a formal proceeding.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Do you know if he had any other prior record other than this?

ADAM PACKER: I might have something.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: The only reason I ask -- and I will wait until you tell me whether you know or not.

ADAM PACKER: I have a copy of his occupational license information page and at the time this was printed, which was just after he reported, it says he does not have an arrest record.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: All I was going to say, put in the context of someone who the Chairman referred to as lower social economic status -- and Phil talked about the fact of -- what his job, in

particular, is. And I don't know what his educational background is. I would assume at least a high school education. The court system is very confusing, the rules and regulations of an administrative agency can be very daunting, even to lawyers. My thought is that your handling of this resolution is appropriate because an ALJ could say no harm no fowl and maybe a probation period and no suspension. And that's just like any legal action where you are intimately involved in it and evaluate the situation and evaluate what the possibility of a stronger outcome in front of a hearing officer would be, taking into consideration the economic status of this man that lost two days of income. And that's what your proposal is; right?

ADAM PACKER: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: And it begins tomorrow?

ADAM PACKER: It would begin at a time to be a arranged by Mr. Combs and the human resource department.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I thought I saw something in here that says it would begin two days after this, but I don't care. So again, I think that your resolution is appropriate given the fact there

is no prior record. And I believe he will get the message. And being off work for a couple of days, the people that work with him will wonder where he was and he will tell them when he gets back and word will get out. But if you've got any of this stuff that pops up, you need to tell them. Was he working prior to this Christmas Eve? Was he an employee at the time it happened; do you know?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I believe he was.

ANDREW KLINGER: I don't know if he was actually working that night, but he was an employee.

ADAM PACKER: He was licensed at that time?

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You know, "As often as you do it to the least of what you do it unto me," is a verse that I heard. So this would be one of the least of us and we don't want to be guilty of that, I don't think.

Do you entertain a motion to accept staff recommendation?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will move to approve.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. All those in favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign of aye.

1.0

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ADAM PACKER: The last occupational license It's a request for revocation matter is 2006-42. of temporary license and denial application for an occupational license of Brenda Wilson. Wilson was issued a Level 2 temporary occupational license on or about September 21, 2006. She disclosed some criminal arrest on her application but failed to disclose at least one, and it was a 1973 arrest and conviction in California for forgery. The commission may not issue an occupational license to an individual that has been convicted of a felony. This forgery charge and conviction was a felony. Therefore, exercise of its authority to revoke this license -- commission staff revoked her license on May 19th, 2006.

At this point, the commission staff recommends that you approve the revocation and denial of her license. But before I turn it over to any questions, I was made aware by Ms. Wilson that she intended to speak at the commission meeting today. I don't believe she's -- oh, she is here. At this time I can turn the floor over to Ms. Wilson and

allow her to address the commission. CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Ms. Wilson. Hello, this is a little BRENDA WILSON: intimidating but I will get through it. COMMISSION ROBINSON: Do you live in Floyd County? BRENDA WILSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: We are practically neighbors. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Are you aware that there is a procedure by which you can ask this commission to waive this felony so you can keep your license? BRENDA WILSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Do you want to jump in? ADAM PACKER: I want to jump in on that. the revocation letter I explained to Ms. Wilson that because of the character of her conviction of forgery, which is a crime of misrepresentation, and so she is ineligible for a felony waiver, I did inform her about the appeal process, though. she has told me that she intends to do that if the commission accepts the recommendation of the staff.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. I have not looked at the statute in a long time of the rules and regulations. Does the statute talk about felony

convictions and the waiver, but there is a specific exception in our ability to waive the felony bar in crimes of dishonesty like forgery?

ADAM PACKER: Yes. There are three categories,

I believe, of felonies that fall within the felony
waiver -- and the crimes of misrepresentation are
not considered for the felony waiver process.

There are certain crimes you have to wait five
years, certain crimes you have to wait 10 years,
and certain crimes where you're not eligible for a
felony waiver at all.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Federal offenses are the forever banned; is that right or not?

ADAM PACKER: It's not whether it's federal or not, but it's a crime against misrepresentation and fraud.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. So just explain to me what the procedure would be. She is here. This is the first time we have ever seen someone in front of us, that I can recall, that addresses the commission. And that's fine, she can talk to us here in a second. But the procedure would be what after today? Let's just assume that we have a discussion and the staff's recommendation is approved -- approve the revocation and deny her

occupational license. And then she can file an appeal with ALJ; is that right?

ADAM PACKER: Yes. She would file appeal of the commission's action.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Right. To the ALJ. And the ALJ could do what if the statute prevents waivers on this sort of offense?

ADAM PACKER: Well, this wouldn't be a waiver. It wouldn't be a felony waiver, but it would be a different proceeding and different procedure. It's a different law and different rule for appeal of commission action.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So there is still an avenue where she could still be successful in front of the ALJ, come back to us, and we would have to approve or disapprove or deny the ALJ's recommendation?

ADAM PACKER: That is correct. The idea is to get that done -- if the process goes the way we have talked about, to get that done in time for the next commission meeting.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So once Ms. Wilson talks to us and we all feel bad and all of that and we would like to help her out, do we even have the ability to do that here today?

1 ADAM PACKER: Staff's recommendation --2 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Legally. 3 ADAM PACKER: From a legal perspective, you 4 have no discretion in this matter at this point. 5 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: All right. Do you understand all of that? 6 7 BRENDA WILSON: Pretty much. 8 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So I'm not sure that we 9 can do anything favorable for you today. 10 long as you understand the procedure and the notice 11 that you've been given from the commission staff, 12 Mr. Chairman, I don't have a problem with her 13 telling us what she wants to tell us. 14 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Carry on, Ms. Wilson. 15 BRENDA WILSON: Well, first of all, I was not 16 aware it was a felony, it's been 33 years. that's why I didn't report it, I wasn't aware of 17 18 that fact. 19 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Excuse me. What is the 20 effect of this proceeding on -- a transcript of 21 this proceeding on what an ALJ reviewing it will 22 hear or see? Will the AJL only be looking at the 23 order or will the ALJ actually be reading or 24 listening to what is said today?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO:

I presume that this is

all on the record. Any discussions that are had prior to your acting today would be part of the record for appeal.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Then is the proceeding before the ALJ an open proceeding -- hearing under AOPA?

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: I believe so. We have separate -- we have regulations that are specific to the gaming position, it lays out the process for appeals, all of which is supposed to comport with AOPA.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: And the reason for the question is whether the witness should be sworn.

If this is her day, she should be sworn. If her day is at the ALJ, then she can be sworn then.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: That's a good question and I hadn't considered it. I'm not so sure that -- this is a public meeting, it's not a public hearing where we hear witnesses. It's an opportunity where we recognize this individual to speak to the commission. You can hear her. We can deny her the opportunity to speak. I don't believe that this commission, public meeting, is subject to the AOPA rules or certain rules to which you are speaking.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Okay. Thank you.

BRENDA WILSON: Okay. It has been 33 years. I was not aware it was a felony or I would have been happy to disclose it. The commission had all of the information about this in January. I made sure and got all of the paperwork together. So I was totally shocked when at the end of May I was revoked.

Secondly, I have spent many years making sure that I did not live a life of crime. When I was younger, unfortunately, I was raised in a household that that was their way of life. I have made sure not to follow that way of life.

I have backing of all of my staff and bosses at Caesars Indiana, so they are willing to help me through this process. I really like the job, I want to keep my license, and I want to clear this up. I have talked to a local attorney, and he does not believe I would have been convicted due to the person that I was with was someone they were after. And according to what he said, that was their way of me not coming back to sue them. So I was just aware I was released on the street and I really don't remember anything other than that.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: How old were you?

1 BRENDA WILSON: 20. 2 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Are you still on your job 3 at Caesars? BRENDA WILSON: I was revoked on May 22nd, so I 4 5 had to turn over my license. 6 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So you aren't working 7 there now? 8 BRENDA WILSON: No. 9 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: What did you do at Caesars? 10 BRENDA WILSON: Executive casino host. 11 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: What do you do? 12 BRENDA WILSON: I do a lot of different things. 13 I help people. I'm, basically, public service; 14 helping with complaints, issues, reservations, 15 telemarketing, a little bit of everything. 16 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: These people that are 17 backing you, are they here today? 18 BRENDA WILSON: They are not, but they are 19 willing to come at any time. I wasn't aware they could speak today, so I did not ask them. 20 21 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: You were placed on a 22 six-month probationary period sometime prior to 23 this? 24 BRENDA WILSON: January.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Of 2006?

BRENDA WILSON: 2006, yes. I have been working there since September of 2005.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. There is a typo in this order, it says September 21, 2006; but September 21, 2005 is when you were issued a temporary occupational license?

BRENDA WILSON: Right.

Several criminal arrests in the application for the occupational license. After learning of these omissions but before having an opportunity to complete full investigation, the staff placed your license on a six-month probation. And as the investigation continued, the staff learned that one of the arrests was a 1973 arrest for this forgery in Orange County, California. If I'm reading this correctly, there were other arrests that you failed to disclose on your application; is that true?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Have you only been

arrested twice, then?

BRENDA WILSON:

BRENDA WILSON: I have had two DUIs, 13 years apart.

There was one other in 1970.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. So that's four arrests?

2.0

1 BRENDA WILSON: Yes. 2 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: When was the most recent? 3 BRENDA WILSON: November of 2004. 4 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Did you disclose those 5 arrests and forget to disclose the 1973 arrest? 6 BRENDA WILSON: Yes, I did disclose everything 7 else. 8 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Do you recall the penalty 9 you received in California on the 1973 arrest? 10 BRENDA WILSON: I was incarcerated for about 11 four months. And all I remember is being released. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Prior to being sentenced 12 13 did you post bond or was that post sent? 14 BRENDA WILSON: I did not post bond. 15 have family -- or I didn't know anyone out there. 16 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. Well, I quess my 17 question is, if a person gets arrested they get a 18 bond put on them. If they can't post a bond, 19 eventually they will plead guilty, get sentenced 20 and get time served. Were you released once you 21 were sentenced? 22 BRENDA WILSON: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. So the judge 24 really didn't give you four months, it's just you

got stuck in jail for four months and then you were

released? 1 2 BRENDA WILSON: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: In our occupation, 4 sometimes it is an easy way to resolve it. A 5 person is more than happy to plead guilty just to 6 get out of jail. 7 BRENDA WILSON: Exactly. 8 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Is that pretty much where 9 you were in the deal back then? 10 BRENDA WILSON: I believe so. 11 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Were you aware at the 12 time this was charged as a felony? 13 BRENDA WILSON: No, I don't remember there was 14 any discussion of a felony. 15 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: What was the 1970 16 arrest? 17 BRENDA WILSON: That was the offense against 18 property, shoplifting. Like I said, I come from a 19 parent that that was her way of life. Not to make 20 excuses, but that was what I was taught. 21 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Did that lead to a 22 conviction? 23 BRENDA WILSON: I don't believe so. 24 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Where was that? What

25

state?

BRENDA WILSON: In Indianapolis. 1 2 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What county? 3 BRENDA WILSON: Marion County. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: And, again, your last 4 5 arrest was how long ago? 6 BRENDA WILSON: 2004, November. 7 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Was that the DUI arrest? 8 BRENDA WILSON: Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Your prior DUI --BRENDA WILSON: I believe '91. 10 11 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. Did you go through 12 a program on that one; do you remember? 13 BRENDA WILSON: I went through a program with 14 the last one in Floyd County. That has been 15 completed. 16 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Were you a juvenile at 17 the time of the 1970 arrest? 18 BRENDA WILSON: I think I was 18. I don't 19 remember more than or less than -- around 18. 20 think I just turned 18. 21 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: The only arrest you did 22 not disclose on your job application was the 1973 23 arrest? 24 BRENDA WILSON: Yes. 25 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: You disclosed the two

1 DUIs? 2 BRENDA WILSON: As far as I have a memory of. 3 ADAM PACKER: I have a copy of that 4 application. There are four arrests listed. The 5 two DUIs and two speeding tickets. The 1970 offense and the 1973 offense are not listed. 6 7 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: And the 1970 offense 8 was in Marion County, Indiana? 9 BRENDA WILSON: Yes. 10 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: What is your 11 explanation for not reporting it? 12 BRENDA WILSON: For not reporting it? 13 COMMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Yes, the 1970 and 1973. 14 15 BRENDA WILSON: I actually did not remember. 16 And to be honest, I didn't want to remember most of 17 it. 18 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: How did you remember? 19 Did somebody bring it to your attention? 20 BRENDA WILSON: The commission notified me that 21 it was there. And they wanted me to provide proof 22 of the outcome. 2.3 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Did you do that? 24 I did that in January. BRENDA WILSON:

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: You were actually able to

get documentation of that and forward that?

BRENDA WILSON: I did.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay, Ms. Wilson. We appreciate you coming up and having the nerve to do that. Quite honestly, I think there are a lot of people that are probably going to be in your situation as we look at the penal system today. We have a significant percentage of elements of our population who is serving time, who is going to be getting out and wanting jobs, and not be able to get jobs because of their situation.

However, I have been informed by our counsel that all we can do today is listen to your program. It's on the record here. And lawyers will direct this particular thing from here on in. We have no other choice but to accept their recommendation based on the law.

BRENDA WILSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: And I really hate to use that word, "based on the law," because I'm from Mississippi and that's how they used to do us. But the law says you can't do this. But we appreciate you, and wish you a lot of luck. And God is going to bless you.

1 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What's the time frame on 2 when she can --3 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a 4 question, sir. 5 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: The order I have in 7 front of me says deny or approve. So we do or we 8 do not have the option? 9 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: What we are advising 10 you is that you can certainly deny the order. 11 we're saying is that we think that's contrary to 12 the law. We think you would be violating the law 13 by denying. That is your legal staff's advice. But you are free to do as you please. 14 15 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: That's why we make the 16 big bucks. 17 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: That's why it's 18 written that way. 19 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Let's say we get involved 20 in this recommendation and approve her license. 21 ADAM PACKER: Well, it would be a 22 reinstatement, but yes. 23 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What person will come 24 before us and cause a problem? 25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I will.

commission is going to instruct our legal staff
that they are going to ignore the law, that's very
clear then that puts us in a very precarious
situation to come before this commission in the
future to try and enforce the laws of the State of
Indiana as it applies to gaming. I'm as
sympathetic with Ms. Wilson as the Chair and
everyone else is, but legal staff has made it very
clear that legally we see no option whatsoever here
for you to act. Like Phil said, you can certainly
ignore the law but that certainly puts us in a very
difficult situation in the future to make
recommendations to this commission.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I have a related commented to the director's comment. As I listened to Ms. Wilson and staff, the arrests that were disclosed were misdemeanors and DUI arrests. The arrests that were not disclosed were crimes of dishonesty. And crimes of dishonesty are the crimes that go to the heart of whether somebody is fit to work in a regulated industry. And that stands out very starkly in my opinion.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Well, the judge can correct me if I'm wrong on this. But if we were in a jury trial and your witness had a prior

conviction in 1973, it would not be admissible 1 2 because of the distance in time. COMMISSIONER BARRETT: That's true. 3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: That's correct. 4 5 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: But the failure to 6 disclose is branded. 7 BRENDA WILSON: Well, I was put on probation 8 for failure to disclose. And that's where I 9 thought the case stood. 10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: I don't think the 11 issue here necessarily is her failure to disclose. 12 It's the type of crime for which she was convicted. 13 ADAM PACKER: Operation of the statute relating 14 to a crime. 15 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: So the Administrative Law 16 Judge has to follow the law, too, doesn't he? 17 GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: That's what we would 18 Your legal staff -- what we are faced with arque. 19 is that the legislature has decided to say 20 something about who can work in this industry. 21 feel we are obligated to follow that until the 22 legislature changes their mind. 23 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you, Ms. Wilson. Wе will move on. 24

COMMISSIONER VOWELS:

I guess we need a motion.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: I move to accept the recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: I second it.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: It's been moved and seconded to accept the staff's recommendation regarding this issue. All of those in favor, let me know by the vote of a sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

1.3

2.0

2.2

2.4

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you.

Supplier license matters, Andrew Klinger.

ANDREW KLINGER: Thank you, Commissioner. Good afternoon, Commissioners. Hopefully, what I have for you today won't be gut wrenching.

The first item on your agenda under supplier license matters is order 2006-45, renewal of suppliers' licenses. Licenses held by Giesecke & Devrient America, Konami Gaming, NRT Technology, ServiceMaster by Wallace, Shuffle Master and Cummins-Allison Corporation. These companies have requested renewal licensure and are currently in compliance with Indiana Code 4-33 68 of the Indiana Administrative Code. All of these suppliers have submitted their renewal fee with the exception of

ServiceMaster by Wallace. I'm not sure exactly what has happened here, but they have not submitted a fee. My staff has been in communication with them today and they are attempting to wire that amount to our office right now. Unfortunately, at this point, I do not have confirmation that that has come through.

So my recommendation at this point would be that the commission adopt the order with the condition in reference to ServiceMaster by Wallace, that that wire transfer actually be submitted and the fee be paid, then the order should stand.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: So what's the number for the one you just spoke about? What's the number? ANDREW KLINGER: Order 2006-45.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Any questions for Andrew?

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So your thought is that with approval, that ServiceMaster by Wallace is sort of in a band?

ANDREW KLINGER: Yes. We will have to adjust the resolution to add that condition that ServiceMasters fee actually hasn't been paid, but I understand that it is happening right now.

Unfortunately, I just don't have the confirmation that the wire transfer has gone through. I

understand we may not be able to have confirmation until tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: With that in mind, I will move to approve order 2006-45.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in the second. All those in favor, let it be known by a vote of the sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

ANDREW KLINGER: The next item regarding suppliers is order 2006-46, which relates to a regulatory violation committed by license supplier Certegy Transactions Services, which is now Fidelity National Information Services. Fidelity and commission staff have agreed to a settlement in this matter, a disciplinary action. Certegy acquired the original supplier license holder, which is gain cash financial, and sought four new officers in this company. Certegy failed to notify the commission or submit an application for transfer to the commission within the 45 days of the acquisition, as required in Title 68 of the Administrative Code. Commission staff considers

this violation to be great. Essentially, we were not aware of who owned this license for a period of time.

However, Certegy has demonstrated some rehabilitation. Certegy has -- once they were aware of the violation they promptly did submit and transferred application. They also have since established a provision of compliance and licensing with an individual who is essentially tasked with the job of maintaining compliance. And since this original transaction, the subsequent transaction between Certegy and Fidelity has taken place and they did timely submit an application for transfer in that situation. So staff entered into an agreement with the current license holder, Fidelity, to settle this matter for \$15,000. The staff recommends that the commission approve the settlement agreement.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Certegy disciplinary action.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So this company bought this company, they sent a letter to the commission staff saying, "What do we do to maintain the license?" And then they get a terrible letter back?

25

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ANDREW KLINGER: About four or five months 1 2 after the transaction was completed, they sent a letter to us saying, "Oh, by the way, this 3 transaction occurred, we have changed some of the 4 5 officers, and so how do we stay in compliance now?" 6 We sent them a letter indicating they were in 7 violation, they needed to submit a transfer 8 application, which they did do so fairly promptly. 9 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Okay. That would be a 10 scary letter to get back. 11 COMMISSIONER MURPHY: What type of service does 12 this company provide? 13 ANDREW KLINGER: Check cashing. 14 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Is there a settlement 15 agreement? 16 ANDREW KLINGER: A settlement agreement has 17 been entered into between Fidelity and it only 18 requires commission approval at this point. 19 COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Have they signed it? 2.0 ANDREW KLINGER: No. That would not occur 21 until it's been approved by the commission. 22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: It may not be in 23 your packet because this was just very recently 24 concluded.

ANDREW KLINGER: Yes. It occurred yesterday.

We have a faxed copy of it, but I don't think it's 1 2 in your packets. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Do we have an order 3 4 2006-46 physically in the room anywhere? 5 ANDREW KLINGER: It's not in the packet but 6 should be -- we should have the order here. 7 order simply states that the commission approves 8 the terms of the settlement, which are as I've 9 explained. They essentially admit to the 10 violation, agree to pay \$15,000. 11 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Any further questions? Ιf 12 not, entertain a motion to accept or reject the 13 staff's recommendation. 14 COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I so move. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Second. 15 16 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second that we 17 accept the staff recommendation regarding order 2006-46. Continue. 18 19 ANDREW KLINGER: We will handle the next two 20 issues together. 21 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Oh. All in favor, let me 22 know by a vote of a sign of aye. 23 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 24 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 25 (NONE)

ANDREW KLINGER: Hopefully, we will save time by dealing with the next two issues together; orders 2006-47 and 48.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

As you may recall from past meetings, there were some outstanding regulatory issues relating to two suppliers, Chipco and Vendingdata. When we last met, the commission further extended the licenses of these two suppliers until this meeting. So the staff has looked into outstanding regulatory issues in other jurisdictions. The investigation of these issues was turned over to our new background and financial investigations unit. staff in the investigations unit determined that both of these suppliers are actually due for a full three-year -- every three years they are due for a full investigation of the licensee. These are due for investigation at this time. They have recommended that we incorporate investigation by these outstanding regulatory issues into a full and complete investigation.

So at this time the staff actually recommends that the commission adopt both orders, which would renew their licenses up to the completion of this year and bring them back up to their normal licensing date, while we would pursue a full

investigation of both companies. I will mention that our investigation at this point has not revealed anything that would require immediate action in either case. We would like to continue investigation of these and any other outstanding regulatory issues in other jurisdictions as part of our complete, full investigation.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: This situation with Vendingdata, just the timing of all of this, they had a hearing in front of the Louisianna Gaming Control Board on September 13, 2005, right after Katrina?

ANDREW KLINGER: Yes. The hearing was actually delayed because of the hurricane. They actually entered into a settlement agreement with the Indiana Gaming Control Board. It was maybe in February or March. I believe it was right before the last commission meeting and we had not had time to process that information at that time. I think our review of that settlement, at this point, did not raise any immediate concerns that would require immediate action. However, I believe there are still some outstanding regulatory concerns that we want to look at as part of a full investigation.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: And Chipco was something

I remember -- Michelle, was that the one where Former Commissioner Newman was asking questions about Chipco?

ANDREW KLINGER: Yes. Chipco had issues, I think, with several different jurisdictions. We were able, to our satisfaction, resolve all of those issues. The one that was outstanding at the last meeting was with British Columbia. We resolved that to our satisfaction. No immediate action needs to be taken, but we can still consider those issues in the context of a full investigation into that company.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So essentially what you are asking for is that these licenses be extended or renewed until a certain date this fall so you can complete the investigation, and then a three-year investigation that will come up anyway; right?

ANDREW KLINGER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I don't have anything further.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Any other questions? If not, we will entertain a motion to accept the staff recommendation for order 2006-47 and order 2006-48.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will move to approve.

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: 1 Second. 2 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. All of 3 those in favor, let me know by the vote of the sign 4 of aye. 5 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 6 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 7 (NONE) CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you, Andrew. 8 9 Chris Gray. Riverboat owner's matters, 10 disciplinary action. 11 CHRISTINA GRAY: Good afternoon, 12 Commissioners. You have before you six settlement 13 agreements that the staff and casinos have worked 14 on together to come to an agreement. The first 15 settlement is with Argosy Casino, order number 16 2006-49, where the casino violated the voluntary 17 exclusion program by allowing participants to 18 receive and redeem two game cash checks. Argosy 19 has agreed to pay a fine of \$11,000. 20 commission staff recommends that you approve the 21 settlement agreement. 22 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You heard the 23 recommendation regarding Argosy order 2006-49, are 24 there any questions?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: Was that in the packet?

Ι

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Under tab 8. COMMISSIONER VOWELS: On the fourth page. 2 3 will move to approve the settlement agreement. COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Second. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. All in 6 favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign of aye. 7 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 8 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 9 (NONE) 10 CHRISTINA GRAY: The second order number, 11 2006-50, is a settlement agreement with Aztar that 12 involves seven counts. The first count is about a 13 poker podium, where a drawer containing chips and 14 currency were kept insecure. During the program 15 audit and follow-up on it, it was noted several 16 times that the door was still being left unsecured. 17 In addition to not securing the funds, it was also 18 noted that extra chips were kept in the drawer and 19 used to force balance any variances in the poker 2.0 room imprest funds. 21 In the second count, a minor was allowed to 22 board the riverboat. 23 The third count violated the rule requiring all

persons boarding on a tax-free pass must have an

appropriate badge. On three different occasions,

24

patrons were allowed to board the casino by going through the crew member turnstiles. All three occurred while the casino was closed to the public.

The fourth count violates the rule requiring the casino to notify the commission agent immediately if the denomination of chip float becomes negative. There were at least seven times from May of 2005 to January of 2006 where the chip float was negative and the local agents were not notified.

The fifth count involves the licensing of employees. The riverboat allowed an occupational licensee to work with an expired badge on five occasions.

The sixth count involves the violation of securing the drop bucket compartments on a slot machine. It was discovered that a drop bucket compartment was left unlocked after it was dropped two days prior.

The final count violates the rule that requires a dedicated camera monitoring the area where the cards were stored. A table game assistant shift manager called surveillance to request extra coverage of a pit podium. When asked why, the assistant shift manager said he wanted to

leave the podium unlocked to allow the floor 1 2 supervisor access to remove decks of cards without having to contact him. During their investigation, 3 4 the commission agents did not find that the podium 5 was left unlocked, but did discover there was no 6 dedicated camera on the podium. 7 Aztar has agreed to a total fine of \$30,000 and 8 the commission staff recommends an approval of this 9 settlement agreement. 10 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Thank you. You have heard 11 the report on Aztar order 2006-50. Are there any 12 questions? This total fine is \$30,000? 13 CHRISTINA GRAY: Yes. 14 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. No questions. The 15 Chair would obtain a motion to accept staff 16 recommendation. 17 COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will move to accept. 18 COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Second. 19 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second. 20 favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign of aye. 21 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 22 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 23 (NONE) 24 CHRISTINA GRAY: Order number 2006-51 is a

settlement agreement with Belterra involving two

minors who were allowed to board the riverboat.

Belterra has agreed to a fine of \$13,500, as they have had several incidents in the past six months.

The commission staff recommends the approval of the settlement agreement.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You have the recommendation

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You have the recommendation of staff regarding Belterra, order 2006-51. Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER FESKO: Move to accept staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second to accept the staff recommendation regarding order number 2006-51. All in favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

1.0

CHRISTINA GRAY: Next is a settlement agreement with Resorts Casino, order 2006-52, involves an occupational licensed employee. There were five employees who were identified working with expired badges. Resorts have agreed to a fine of \$7,500. The commission staff recommends that the settlement agreement be approved.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Recommendation of the staff regarding Resorts, order 2006-52. Are there questions? If not, the Chair will entertain a motion to accept staff's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Move to accept.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: It's been moved in second.

All those in favor, let me know by a vote of sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

CHRISTINA GRAY: Order 2006-53 is a settlement agreement with Caesars Indiana that includes two counts. The first count violated regulations receiving approval before revising associated equipment, approval of patron counting equipment and notifying the commission agent immediately if the primary patron counting system malfunctions.

In August of 2005, Caesars upgraded the turnstiles without written approval from the gaming commission. And while they were replacing the turnstiles, they lost the function of them, causing a problem with the counting of patrons. The security personnel began uses clickers to count the

1 patrons. 2 In the second count, a minor attending a 3 private party was allowed to board the riverboat. Caesars has agreed to a total fine of \$16,500. 4 5 The commission staff recommends the settlement 6 agreement be approved. 7 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. You've heard the recommendation of the staff regarding Caesars in 8 9 the settlement order 2006-53. Are there any 10 questions? If not, the Chair will entertain a 11 motion to accept the staff recommendation. 12 COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Move to approve. 13 COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Second. 14 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in the second. 15 those in favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign 16 of aye. 17 (COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE) 18 CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed? 19 (NONE) 20 CHRISTINA GRAY: Finally, order number 2006-54, 21 a settlement agreement of Grand Victoria involving 22 five counts. 23 Count I is a violation of maintaining a chip

25 Count II violated the collection of bill

and token redemption log by nongaming employees.

validator boxes when an employee missed a box during the drop process.

Count III violated an internal control requiring positive and current identification from a patron. Grand Victoria had a patron that presented an expired driver's license when claiming a jackpot. A slot shift manager ordered the supervisor to change the date of a patron in the computer system so that it was current.

inventory at the end of each shift, recording all overages and shortages. It also violated internal controls and standard operating procedures. An internal investigation by Grand Victoria discovered that cage personnel were in the habit of correcting wash variances by moving cash.

The final count, Count V, violated the sensitive key regulations wherein a slot attendant took home sensitive keys.

Grand Victoria has agreed to a total fine of \$24,500. The commission staff recommends that the settlement agreement be approved.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: You heard the staff recommendation regarding order 2006-54 regarding Grand Victoria. Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Make a motion to accept the staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in the second to accept the staff recommendation regarding order 2006-54. All those in favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

CHRISTINA GRAY: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE YELTON: Members of the Commission, I guess I need to apologize to Edna and Lea, both. I did announce their appointments at our last meeting but I had forgotten that they were both at the table games training program with Superintendent Mahan. And I apologize for not introducing them today, but I will make it up with Lea.

Lea Ellingwood is one of our new staff attorneys who came to us from the Department of Toxicology, I believe.

LEA ELLINGWOOD: It is a pleasure to appear before you today. In light of the fact that I am the second to last or third to the last person to appear on the agenda, I'm going to try to keep this

1 at or under 90 seconds.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: We love you, love you, love you.

LEA ELLINGWOOD: So I will talk about orders

2006-55 and 56 which deal with the renewal of three
riverboat licenses. Horseshoe Hammond and Majestic

Star I and II.

Horseshoe Hammond license will expire on June

19th. The license for Majestic Star I and II

expired on June 2nd. However, pursuant to

authority granted by the commission previously, the

Executive Director temporarily extended those

licenses for consideration by you today. All three riverboats are in compliance with the statutes and regulations. All agreed to have paid the \$5,000 annual renewal fee. And the staff recommends that the commission renew all three licenses.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. You heard the recommendation from the staff regarding Majestic Star I and II and Horseshoe regarding license renewal. Any questions? If not, the Chair will entertain a motion to accept the staff's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I will move on 55, 56, 57 to renew the license.

COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: It's been moved in the second. All those in favor, let it be known by a vote of a sign of aye.

(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?

(NONE)

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Horseshoe new vessel -EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Thank you,
Mr. Chair.

As you may recall, several months ago we were contacted by the corporate officials and local officials from Horseshoe indicating that -- an indication they may be looking towards developing a new boat up north. And since we have met, their Board of Directors has approved the project. It has now been announced. So we've invited the representatives from Harrah's to make a presentation to the members of the board of the commission to see their vision and their plan. We are always pleased to have before us one of the presidents of Harrah's, Mr. Anthony SanFilippo.

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Chairman and Members of the Commission, Judge Yelton and members of his staff. We are

proud and pleased to be in front of you. We have a number of things that we hope you will find also pleasing and it has to do with the expansion as Executive Director Yelton just described, a Hammond property.

1.8

If I may just step back a little bit. Two years ago, July 1st, we merged with Horseshoe. And I am very pleased to say that it has been a very nice marriage. We were in front of you two years ago asking for your approval. And one of the things I did when I first met Rick Mazer, the then and now general manager, was talk about expansion plans. And Rick has a vision to expand this facility that was much more modest than we have been able -- we have since been able to have approved by our board of directors.

And what was important to us, as we looked at this expansion, was that we added more to the facility than just gaming. And Rick is going to take you through that. You will see we have added a truly -- a world class entertainment venue that seats 2,500 individuals for the theater-style concert, 3,000 for boxing, and about 1,300 for a seated dinner. We are actually partnered with an entertainment firm out of Canada who designs these

types of venues all over the world and designed the Caesars Palace Coliseum in Las Vegas, which is considered a world renowned gaming. Now, we purchased Caesars Entertainment last summer and we're the owners of Caesars Indiana and that has allowed us to get access to some other vendors, like this one, to be able to build into this project what we have and what we will show you. We have also put in place a truly world-class buffet. And Rick will show you the space for that. And we have been able to on this vessel put on the very first floor all of our gaming. So from a customer standpoint they can enjoy gaming on one level.

We will show you -- in fact, you can see it here, this is the existing site plan. And one of these -- I'm not sure this one here -- I think it's that one there, shows you how the footprint will look once we have completed the facility. So it is taking up much more space than we currently have here. It is even deceiving by looking at the renderings we're going to show you. It is a footprint that takes up a large amount of space and transforms this project. The cost of the project is \$485,000,000, and that is a significant investment for our company.

When we were considering this, which we have been doing for the last few years, it was important to us that a couple of things occur. One was the stability of this state with this industry. Our chairman and CEO, Gary Levin, and myself and Rick requested, through Executive Director Yelton a meeting with the governor to be able to sit and talk about the industry and talk about his views on this industry in the state. He was very positive to me. He asked very good questions about the industry and gave us a lot of confidence that it would continue to be run and regulated in a way that would allow us to go to our Board of Directors and ask for \$485,000,000 and do the kind of ambitious project that we have here.

Now, that's not the case in every jurisdiction and every state that we operate in, and that is an important factor for us, whether it is here domestically in the United States, or whether it is internationally, that we have a degree of confidence in how the business is going to be administered in the respective state. So we are very pleased, after the discussions with both Judge Yelton, as well as with the governor, to move forward with this investment.

I'm also pleased to say today we have employee a little over 2,000 on a -- 2,250 team members at this property. And we believe when it's all said and done that we will have another 500 team members join us because of the project that we're going to present to you. We are expected to have this open in about two years.

And because of the size and complexity of this project, it will take us that length of time to be able to construct this project and place this project in service. The way we have been able to work the construction of it, the hulls, which are the major part of this facility, are about -- \$60,000,000 worth of this facility are being constructed today in the southern part of the United States. There wasn't in this part of the United States shipyards able to do that. And those will come up towards the end of this year and that will build the majority of this project from the hulls up at the site.

We have had a wonderful working partnership with Mayor Mcdermitt from Hammond in being able to go through the process locally that we needed to go through to be able to have this project approved and accepted by not only the mayor but also the

city council members. And people in northwest

Indiana are very excited about this project coming
to Hammond. We will be happy to answer any
questions that you might have about the project.

We are diligently working to meet goals that would both include minority-owned firms as well as woman-owned firms. I mentioned that \$60,000,000 of what is being built is being built in a place that is highly specialized. And another \$43,000,000 is slot machines for this. So over \$100,000,000 of this project are items that we don't have the ability to go and source it through either women or minority-owned firms in the state, but what is remaining we will work diligently to be all-inclusive as we develop this project.

Rick Mazer has been the general manager of this property since day one. It has known no other general manager. They purchased it and turned it in to Horseshoe. We will continue the Horseshoe brand and only strengthen it. And Rick is now going to come up and take you through a series of boards that will give you an idea of the field and property. As I mentioned, we continue to do a detailed design work and, in fact, we will be leaving here to meet with our architects and

designers to continue the work. I believe you will get a very very good feel of what we are going to be able to create and put into service in two years.

RICK MAZER: Chairman, Commissioners,

Executive Director and staff. Thank you very much.

I'm pleased to be here for this project. This is

something that I have been working on for a very

long time. And it is great to finally get it over

the finish line or almost. After those comments,

I'm just about done. I will quickly walk you

through some of these elements. I will have to

step away.

This is basically what the project will look like. It is in six sections. Three shippards are being designed. One is actually in Indiana, not to far from you, Commissioner Vowels. I think not too far from LaMar, Indiana.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I don't know where that is.

RICK MAZER: They have two. Each of these sections will be set into the Port of Indiana as our harbor, where they are vertical beams placed that will move inside the marina itself. They will be put together and then the structure will be on

That will be what the structure pretty much top. The box itself is -- this is an idea looks like. The first floor is all gaming. of the box. is the second floor. It's 175,000 square feet of space per level; just under. So altogether there is about 350,000 square feet, over 300,000 is public space. First floor is all gaming. second floor is really something special. gaming floor itself, this is a good idea of what the gaming floor will look like, although we continue to work with the details as far as the actual woods we're going to use, the moldings that we're going to use and things like that. deck is 30 feet. So as we put the treatment in -on down, we will have ceiling heights and some out coves as high as 27 feet. And some areas will be created to be a little smaller in order to create more spaces.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'll give you a general feel of the extremely high level of finishes that we are going to use. These finishes are equivalent, in many areas, to the level of finishes -- the best I could say, it's probably closest to Bellagio in Las Vegas, if you have ever been there.

On the casino floor, in addition to just

gaming, we will have a couple of other elements.

We will have a feature bar that will be situated down there. There will be a couple of them. Here is an example of what our feature bar will look like and continue to work with the exact details. That will be located right on the casino floor.

On the second level, we move up, we have a buffet which is a 650-seat buffet. Our existing buffet is, approximately, 280 seats; so the size is dramatically different. This is an idea of what the buffet -- it is consistent with the buffets that we have in Tunica and is consistent with what Horseshoe buffet has always been.

One of the things we wanted to make sure of is take advantage of the views. Our view along this parameter -- it looks out on the marina itself.

And the skyline of Chicago. So what we have done here is on the second floor, this is all windows, which you can kind of tell in here. All of these windows -- this is literally open to be able to take advantage of the views and skyline of Chicago on the six or seven days you can actually see it.

COMMISSIONER: There are a number of question.

Are there going to be windows on the main floor?

RICK MAZER: This area is a VIP lounge. And

that also is on the first level and it sits behind the gaming. That will also have the same exact views. One of the real, real pieces that are just absolutely exquisite. This is a state of the art facility and is our entertainment center. It is a flexible space and it is absolutely an exquisite theater.

2.0

This is an idea of how it is set up for a regular stage presentation where you have a stage. It has the ability to be reconfigured for a sit-down gala event that will seat up to \$1,400 for dinner. And also has the ability to be broken down into smaller groups and a box configuration can handle up to \$3,000.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: This is something that exists now, what we are seeing?

RICK MAZER: It will be built.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: It looks like a photograph.

RICH MAZER: Yes, this new computer age is unbelievable.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: I hear it's the thing of the future.

RICK MAZER: It will sit here and be on the vessels.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: So that is a computer rendering.

2.3

COMMISSIONER: Can I make a comment or two or three.

First of all, I'm not familiar with this property. I live fairly close to it and I've been there a number of times for a number of charity events hosted by Mr. Mazer. He has been a very good contributor toward our community and his company. They are what we call good neighbors. They invite every charity that I sit on the board or are involved in. They have a presence and they support as many things as they possibly can, so they have been very good neighbors.

Rick, I do have a couple of questions. This is not meant to be negative, but I'm sure you have already passed this thought or this thought has come up with the city council and with the mayor. It looks like you are going to be taking out a number of boat slips in the marina to facilitate this?

RICK MAZER: Yeah. Actually, in respect to the marina, it will be 27 slips.

COMMISSIONER: Is that all?

RICK MAZER: That's it.

COMMISSIONER: I'm looking at your rendering and it looks like a 100 or so.

RICK MAZER: What will happen is these slips come in, but they get filled in back here. There were originally slips back here that we had to take out, but we will be able to fill those back in. So they just get repositioned, so 27 slips.

COMMISSIONER: What are you doing with your old gaming facility, old boat, if you want to call it that?

RICK MAZER: It's for sale. It's a possibility to get transferred to another license. Another one of our areas that might have a product that is not as nice as this one. It could be sold or could end up at Middle Steel as scrap.

ANTHONY SANFLLIPPO: Explain how we're going to build it and move it over.

RICK MAZER: What will happen, as we get in here -- the best way to show it, it will get built in slight. As these pieces come in, they will be welded and put together at the building site so there is no disruption to the existing operation.

Customers will not even know that this is occurring unless they look. So that's the best part. We can continue with our revenue streams and keep things

ready to move this in place. Then as we come in we will put these docks in. There will be some docks left in here and then the rest. And that's mandated as to the distance that is needed.

1.0

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: We anticipate about six days it will take.

RICK MAZER: Working with staff and hopefully we hope that within a week we can make this transfer smooth.

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: So a few days we are down we are trying to work out -- because of the way this is being built on site, it will -- only what it takes us to move the existing vessels out and move the new one in and do all the hookups with the new vessel.

RICK MAZER: All of the pieces will be there on land and it will slide in and be enjoyed.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Has someone turned the present boat on to make sure the engine still works to be able to move it out?

RICK MAZER: They keep excellent care of it. So it's not a problem.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: In reference to that, you may recall that the coast guard declined

certification of boats, beginning with the new boat constructed by Argosy. And, again, Horseshoe would be defined as a permanently mored vessel, which they will not certify. As of Monday we got from ADS what they propose to be the final draft of maritime standards and life safety standards, which we have been in discussion with the coast guard about. I'm not convinced it will be the last draft but we are hopeful it will be the next to the last draft.

And hopefully, by the next meeting we will have those standards adopted, in place, that will apply to Argosy and Horseshoe and all of the other new vessels that would follow. And, perhaps, apply, if chosen, by the other existing licensees.

COMMISSIONER: Nice.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: What is your time frame again?

RICK MAZER: Two years.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: \$485,000,000?

RICK MAZER: \$485,000,000.

COMMISSIONER: What is the start date?

RICK MAZER: It has been started. The shipyard has already started the process. First two sections will be up here in February.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: You told us also that the financing for this is covered and complete?

RICK MAZER: Yeah, with an existing line of credit that the company already has.

GENERAL COUNSEL SICUSO: So they will not be coming before you for additional approval to actually pay for this?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR JENNIFER ARNOLD: We are neutral as regulators, but at the same time we are here to promote economic development. And I would just like to thank Harrah's for making this commitment here in Indiana.

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: Thank you very much.

commissioner vowels: And you mentioned this earlier and I've read the publications. But one reason that you feel comfortable doing that in Indiana is, it appears, that the gaming legislation up to this point, and what you can see in the future, has been stable and not a moving target; that you don't have to be as concerned here as you have been in other states. You don't have to comment on that so the other states think you are saying anything negative, but that is a plus here. And I hope that is helpful to other gaming companies that operate here in Indiana, that the

stability is something that they can rely upon.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Quite candidly,

CEO Gary Lovman last week had an article that

actually ended up nationally, where he directly

told the State of Illinois the reason they were

going to invest money in Indiana and not Illinois

is because of the environment of the legislature

and this commission. He specifically said that.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Not only do I hope within the industry it's understood but our legislature too the value of stability.

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: If I may add, we do talk openly about that. And it is as described a lot about economic development for us it's the same. We were materially affected in Mississippi and also Louisianna by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. And because of federal legislation that came out that has accelerated depression in the first year of anything built new, we are looking at more ambitious plans in Biloxi that we normally wouldn't have looked at.

And any type of -- whether it's incentives to encourage us to build -- just like any other business, it's important to us. Because our capital dollars -- we're looking at not only

throughout the United States, but also we are developing projects in Spain and the Bahamas and looking at Slovenia and other places. And it's helpful when states are the way Indiana has been, which is a very high tax state, but at least we understand or we can see what the future is or have confidence in the future. It helps us make a decision like this, which is a significant decision.

When we went to our board for approval, it really was a little about the project. And most of the discussion was talked to us about the state. Very little about what exactly you are building, but much more about to invest this kind of money we really want to understand your confidence in the state and those that regulate in the state for us to approve this type of investment.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: Are you finding Slovenia more stable than --

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: Still trying to work through that one right now.

COMMISSIONER VOWELS: That should send a message around the continental of the United States. I don't have anything else to say.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Anything else? Thank you

very much. It looks good.

ANTHONY SANFILIPPO: Thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. Our next meeting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR YELTON: Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission, our next meeting is tomorrow, June 8th. Bear in mind that we have an executive session beginning on the 9th floor of the National City Bank Building at 9 a.m. The meeting will commence at 1:30 on the 2nd floor of the Hyatt, which I believe is the Regency A and B on the 2nd floor of the Hyatt Regency. We were informed that during this meeting the Attorney General should have his investigative report ready for your examination and it will be back at the office. For those of you who would like to take a glance at it this evening, please feel free to come back to the IGC office and, hopefully, your copies will be available.

Our next meeting following that will be September 14th at a place yet to be determined. With that, Mr. Chair, I believe there is no further business today.

CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Okay. We want to thank everybody. You guys did a really good job. Could I get a motion to adjourn?

1	COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Motion that we adjourn.
2	COMMISSIONER ROBINSON: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Move in second we adjourn.
4	All those in favor, let me know by a vote of a sign
5	of aye.
6	(COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED AYE)
7	CHAIRMAN CALLOWAY: Those opposed?
8	(NONE)
9	(INDIANA GAMING COMMISSION BOARD MEETING
10	ADJOURNED)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF INDIANA)
2) SS:
3	COUNTY OF MARION)
4	
5	
6	I, Robin L. Helton, a Notary Public in and for
7	said county and state, do hereby certify that the
8	Gaming Commission Business Meeting, June 7, 2006,
9	at 1:00 p.m., was taken down in stenograph notes
10	and afterwards reduced to typewriting under my
11	direction, and that the typewritten transcript is a
12	true record of the proceedings held.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREFORE, I have hereunto set my
14	hand and affixed my notarial seal this 20th day of
15	June, 2006.
16	
17	
18	
19	Robin L. Helton, Notary Public, Residing in Marion County, Indiana
20	noblasing in market obtainer, in arama
21	
22	
23	My Commission Expires: June 6, 2009
2 4	